The Journal of Historical Review

Volume 14, Number 4 July / August 1994

Stalin's War Against His Own Troops: The Tragic Fate of Soviet Prisoners
Yuri Teplyakov

D-Day Reflections of a World War II Veteran
Charles E. Weber

A Bitter French Retrospective After 50 Years

Bradley Smith's "Campus Project" Success

How Zionist Leaders Doctored Historical Documents

"History by Night or in Fog": A French Scholar Responds to Pressac's New Auschwitz Book
Serge Thion

A Pervasive Fear
Joseph Sobran

Revisionist Activism

— Reviews —

Powers' Heisenberg's War
Andrew Gray

— And More —

The Unsurpassed Standard Refutation

THE HOAX OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

THE CASE AGAINST THE PRESUMED EXTERMINATION OF EUROPEAN JEWRY



Yehuda Bauer and Prof. Moshe Davis agreed that there is a "recession in guilt feeling" over the Holocaust, encouraged by fresh arguments that the reported extermination of six million Jews during World War II never took place... "You know, it's not difficult to fabricate history," Davis added. —Chicago *Sun-Times*, Oct. 25, 1977

You can't discuss the truth of the Holocaust. That's a distortion of freedom of speech. The U.S. should emulate West Germany, which outlaws such public exercises. —Franklin Littell, Temple University. Quoted in: *Jerusalem Post*, weekly edition, Oct. 19-25, 1980

IN SPITE OF THE MANY IMPORTANT BREAKTHROUGHS in Revisionist scholarship since it was first published in 1976, Dr. Butz' pathbreaking study remains unsurpassed as the standard scholarly refutation of the Holocaust extermination story.

In more than 400 pages of penetrating analysis and lucid commentary, he gives the reader a graduate course on the fate of Europe's Jews during the Second World War. He scrupulously separates the cold facts from the tonnage of stereotyped myth and propaganda that has served as a formidable barrier to the truth for half a century.

Chapter by solidly referenced chapter, he applies the scholar's rigorous technique to every major aspect of the Six Million legend, carefully explaining his startling conclusion that "the Jews of Europe were not exterminated and there was no German attempt to exterminate them."

Focusing on the postwar "war crimes trials," where the prosecution's evidence was falsified and secured by coercion and even torture, Dr. Butz re-examines the very German records so long misrepresented. Reviewing the demographic statistics which do not allow for the loss of the "Six Million," he concludes that perhaps a million Jews may have perished in the turmoil of deportation, internment and war. He re-evaluates the concept and technical feasibility of the legendary extermination "gas chambers."

Maligned by people who have made no effort to read it, denounced by those unable to refute its thesis, ***The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*** has sent shock waves through the academic and political world. So threatening has it been to the international Holocaust lobby that its open sale has been banned in several countries, including Israel, Germany and Canada.

In four important supplements contained in this edition (including his lecture presented to the Eleventh International Revisionist Conference, October, 1992) the author reports on key aspects of the continuing international Holocaust controversy.

Now in its ninth US printing, this semi-underground best seller remains the most widely read Revisionist work on the subject — must reading for anyone who wants a clear picture of the scope and magnitude of the historical cover-up of the age.

Dr. Arthur R. Butz was born and raised in New York City. He received his Bachelor of Science and Master of Science degrees in Electrical Engineering from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. In 1965 he received his doctorate in Control Sciences from the University of Minnesota. In 1966 he joined the faculty of Northwestern University (Evanston, Illinois), where he is now Associate Professor of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences. Dr. Butz is the author of numerous technical papers. Since 1980 he has been a member of the Editorial Advisory Committee of *The Journal of Historical Review*, published by the Institute for Historical Review.

New, Quality Softcover Edition • 403 pages • $9.95 + $2 shipping
ISBN 0-939484-46-3 • Published by Institute for Historical Review

Hear Prof. Butz on Audiotape from three Revisionist Conferences ($9.95 ea. + $1 postage)
1979—The International "Holocaust" Controversy
1982—Context and Perspective in the "Holocaust" Controversy
1992—Some Thoughts on Pressac's Opus

Editor: Mark Weber
Associate Editor: Greg Raven
Review Editor: Theodore J. O'Keefe

EDITORIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Advisors are not spokespersons of the educational institutions identified.

GEORGE ASHLEY, Ph.D
Los Angeles Unified School District (Ret.)

ENRIQUE AYNAT, L.L.B.
Torreblanca, Spain

PHILIP BARKER, Ph.D
Minneapolis, Minnesota

JOHN BENNETT, L.L.B.
Australian Civil Liberties Union
Melbourne, Australia

FRIEDRICH P. BERG, B.Sc.
Ft. Lee, New Jersey

ALEXANDER V. BERKIS, L.L.M., Ph.D.
Professor of History (Ret.)
Longwood College
Farmville, Virginia

W. BEVERAGGI-ALLENDE, L.L.B., Ph.D.
University of Buenos Aires
Buenos Aires, Argentina

ARTHUR R. BUTZ, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of
Electrical Engineering & Computer Science
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

BOYD CATHEY, Ph.D.
The Southern Partisan
Columbia, South Carolina

ROBERT H. COUNTESS, Ph.D.
Huntsville, Alabama

ALBERT J. ECKSTEIN, Ph.D.
Private Research Consultant

ROBERT FAURISSON, Ph.D.
University of Lyon-2
Lyon, France

GEORG FRANZ-WILLING, Ph.D.
Überlingen, Germany

VERNE E. FUERST, Ph.D.
Hartford, Connecticut

SAMUEL EDWARD KONKIN III
Long Beach, California

R. CLARENCE LANG, Ph.D., M. Div.
Seguin, Texas

JAMES MARTIN, Ph.D.
Colorado Springs, Colorado

CARLO MATTOGNO
Rome, Italy

HIDEO MIKI
Professor of History (Ret.)
National Defense Academy
Yokosuka, Japan

REVILO P. OLIVER, Ph.D.
University of Illinois (Ret.)
Urbana, Illinois

HENRI ROQUES, Ph.D.
Colombes, France

WILHELM STÄGLICH, Dr. Jur.
Glücksburg, Germany

UDO WALENDY, Diplo. Pol.
Vlotho/Weser, Germany

CHARLES E. WEBER, Ph.D.
Head, Dept. of Modern Languages (Ret.)
University of Tulsa (Oklahoma)

The Journal of Historical Review

Volume 14, Number 4 July / August 1994

IN THIS ISSUE

From the Editor 2

Stalin's War Against His Own Troops 4
Yuri Teplyakov

D-Day Reflections of an American World War II Veteran 11
Charles E. Weber

Bitter French Retrospective after Fifty Years 14

Revisionists To Meet for Twelfth IHR Conference 16

Bradley Smith's "Campus Project" Success 18

How Zionist Leaders Doctored Historical Documents 25

A French Scholar Responds to Pressac's New Auschwitz Book 28
Serge Thion

A Pervasive Fear 40
Joseph Sobran

Martyrdom of the Russian Church Under Communism 41

Getting Out the Word: Revisionist Activism 42

The Father of Wartime Germany's Atomic Bomb Program 44
A Review by Andrew Gray

Secretary Shultz and the Bitburg Uproar 45
A Review by Andrew Gray

Letters 47

On the Cover: Soviet prisoners of war captured during the 1941 campaign are marched to German camps behind the lines.

The Journal of Historical Review (ISSN: 0195-6752) began publication in 1980. It upholds and continues the tradition of Historical Revisionism of scholars such as Harry Elmer Barnes, A.J.P. Taylor, William H. Chamberlin, Paul Rassinier and Charles Tansill. *The Journal of Historical Review* is published six times yearly by the **Institute for Historical Review**, P.O. Box 4296, Torrance, CA 90510, USA. Subscription price: $40 per year, $65 for two years, and $90 for three years. For foreign subscriptions, add $10 per year. For overseas airmail delivery, add $30 per year. Remittances for subscriptions must be payable in US dollars drawable on a US bank.

Single issues — Spring 1986 (Volume 7) to the present — are available for sale for $7.50 each, plus $1.05 shipping. Back issues of the *Journal* are also available for purchase in hardbound annual volumes for the years 1984, 1985, 1986, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991 and 1992, for $35.00 each. Please write for our booklist and prices. Quantity subscription and bulk issue rates are available upon request.

Appropriate manuscripts are welcomed by the Editor. They should be double-spaced and accompanied by return postage. Especially welcome are submissions on IBM-compatible or Macintosh computer diskette. Please address all correspondence to P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659

The Journal of Historical Review is listed in standard periodical directories, and is a member of the Conference of Historical Journals. Contributions do not necessarily reflect the views of the Institute for Historical Review.

All rights reserved. Except for specifically copyrighted items, permission is hereby given to reprint material from this issue of the *Journal*, provided that no changes or alterations are made without prior arrangement, and providing that the following attribution appears with the material: "Reprinted from *The Journal of Historical Review*, P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659, USA. Subscriptions: $40 per year (domestic)." A copy of the reprint should be sent to the Editor.

From the Editor

Ten years ago — on the Fourth of July 1984 — unknown terrorists firebombed our office-warehouse complex in an attempt to destroy the Institute for Historical Review and forever silence *The Journal of Historical Review.*

These criminals nearly succeeded. (For more about this, see *The Zionist Terror Network*, a 20-page booklet available from the IHR.) In an emergency letter to supporters following the attack, IHR Director Thomas Marcellus reported:

> As a physical entity, the Institute for Historical Review has virtually ceased to exist. Ninety percent of our book and tape inventory — the largest collection of revisionist literature to be found anywhere — has been wiped out. Every last piece of office equipment and machinery — including desks, chairs, files and shelves — lay in charred heaps of useless, twisted scrap.
>
> Manuscripts, documents, artwork, galleys and film negatives — products of more than six long years of a tough, dedicated effort to bring suppressed historical data to people the world over — no longer exist. Tens of thousands of books . . . estimated at over $300,000 in value, are gone . . . More than 2,500 square feet of space that was once the world's most controversial publisher lies blackened in chaos and total ruin.

As everyone knows, of course, the attack failed to finish off the IHR. Under Marcellus' directorship, and with the generous support of friends across America and in many foreign lands, we were able to rebuild.

Today — ten years later — the Institute for Historical Review is more influential, more professionally managed, and more responsibly organized than ever. Particularly during the last two years — and in spite of an unceasing barrage of media smears and lies — the IHR and its work have become widely known across America and around the world.

While media coverage of our work continues to be overwhelming hostile, historical revisionism and the IHR are now grudgingly accepted as a established part of the American social-cultural landscape. Just recently *The Los Angeles Times* described the IHR as a "think tank that critics call the 'spine of the international Holocaust denial movement'." Indeed, the IHR is at the center of a worldwide network of scholars and activists who are working — sometimes at great personal sacrifice — to separate historical fact from propaganda fiction by researching and publicizing suppressed facts about key chapters of twentieth century history.

Along with growing effectiveness comes, inevitably, ever more fevered opposition from formidable enemies. As our influence grows, and the great social-cultural struggle of the Western world intensifies, so also does the fury and desperation of our adversaries.

In some countries, the traditional enemies of intellectual freedom and free inquiry use repressive laws to punish revisionists who express dissident views about twentieth century history. While it is true that "our" government lays out millions of taxpayer dollars annually to counter the work of the IHR and other revisionists, we are nevertheless very grateful to live in a country where the First Amendment protects our right to work and publish.

In the daily struggle, we are proud to employ our modest financial resources cost-effectively. For every dollar we lay out, enemies such as the Anti-Defamation League are obliged to spend a hundred.

Although my work here as editor of *The Journal of Historical Review* is often very demanding, it is also emotionally and intellectually satisfying. To be able to write freely and forthrightly about the most important, and most taboo-laden, social-historical issues of our time is source of great satisfaction. It is a pleasure to be able to help provide a forum for important writing by others whose words might otherwise never be read. There's plenty to worry about as editor, but being fired for offending some Politically Correct icon is, happily, not one of them.

Every day, it seems, brings a fascinating new challenge. It might be responding to an insistent fax message from a colleague in Europe who needs, immediately, a copy of an important background report from our archives; arranging an radio interview with a producer; participating in a hastily called office meeting to decide how best to respond to a just-published press attack; working out the content and layout of the next issue of this *Journal*; carefully considering a newly-arrived book manuscript for possible publication; dealing with a reporter who wants a quote for an article he's writing about revisionism; meeting for lunch with an important supporter who is visiting from out of state; composing an encouraging letter to a profes-

sor in an Asian country who is an enthusiastic but still fearful supporter; conversing with a high school student who is preparing a class paper; or, detailed late-night work on a lengthy manuscript to put it into publishable form.

There is no "typical" IHR supporter. He or she might be a store manager in Missouri, a retired school teacher in Australia, an accountant in western Canada, a student in Sweden, a truck driver in Connecticut, a housewife in South Africa, a professor in New York, an airline pilot in Connecticut, a salesman in Georgia, or a real estate agent in Montana. At the same time, IHR supporters and *Journal* subscribers do share some things in common. For one thing, they tend to be considerably more thoughtful, socially conscious, and intelligent than average.

A *Journal* subscriber typically has a keen interest in understanding how and why the world has become what it is today. He is fed up with recycled wartime propaganda being passed off as "history." He is tired of socially destructive lies and bigotry, and puts a premium on truth and honesty. He wants a sane and healthy future for himself, his family and his country, indeed for all humanity, and realizes that it can only be achieved through an understanding of history and the world based on truth and reality.

Nearly every day we receive letters and cards — sometimes touchingly written — expressing appreciation for our work. This support is not only profoundly gratifying, it imposes on us a solemn obligation to keep faith with the men and women around the world who are counting on us, particularly those who have really suffered and sacrificed as a consequence of their support for the IHR and its mission. This means a duty to uphold high editorial and ethical standards, to act responsibly for the best long-term interests of the Institute and the cause it represents.

In a world so saturated with historical lies and self-serving propaganda, the Institute for Historical Review stands as a precious beacon. Nothing quite like it exists anywhere else in the world. Once, referring to the remarkable team of men and women who work together here, French Professor Robert Faurisson aptly described the IHR as a minor miracle.

With a profound sense of gratitude to all those who have made our success possible, and a sense of solemn obligation to uphold the standards of the IHR, we pledge to carry on to help make this a better world for us all. With your continued support, we will see to it that the next ten years will be our most successful ever.



Are you reading a borrowed copy of

The Journal of Historical Review?

Why not have your own copy of ***The Journal*** delivered regularly to your home or office?

Now in its exciting new full-sized bi-monthly format, ***The Journal***'s scope has been expanded to embrace a broader revisionism. We're taking on a wider range of issues with the same high regard for facts and the same keen analysis on which ***Journal*** and ***IHR Newsletter*** readers have come to rely.

And now that ***The Journal*** incorporates the ***IHR Newsletter***, you have a single source for an abundance of interesting, insightful news and thoughtful commentary on issues that affect you, your loved ones, your community and the world around you. And you'll be kept right up to date as well on the vital activities of the world's foremost institution dedicated to setting the record straight and keeping it that way, the Institute for Historical Review.

The new ***Journal*** is now published more frequently, it's easier to read, more visually appealing, and addresses a broader range of your interests. But most important is what has *not* changed – the distinctive qualities that have always distinguished the ***The Journal***: its taboo-smashing iconoclasm, its independent, scholarly perspective on issues and events, and its uncompromising devotion to historical honesty.

Subscriptions are still only $40 per year, $65 for two years, or $90 for three years (foreign subscribers please add $10 per year). Please remit by check, money order, VISA or MasterCard. (California Residents must add 7.75% state sales tax.)

So why not subscribe today or why not give a gift subscription to a friend, local public or college library?

INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW • P.O. Box 2739 • Newport Beach, CA 92659

Stalin's War Against His Own Troops

The Tragic Fate of Soviet Prisoners of War in German Captivity

YURI TEPLYAKOV

At dawn on June 22, 1941, began the mightiest military offensive in history: the German-led Axis attack against the Soviet Union. During the first 18 months of the campaign, about three million Soviet soldiers were taken prisoner. By the end of the conflict four years later, more than five million Soviet troops are estimated to have fallen into German hands. Most of these unfortunate men died in German captivity.

A major reason for this was the unusual nature of the war on the eastern front, particularly during the first year — June 1941–June 1942 — when vastly greater numbers of prisoners fell into German hands than could possibly be accommodated adequately. However, and as Russian journalist Teplyakov explains in the following article, much of the blame for the terrible fate of the Soviet soldiers in German captivity was due to the inflexibly cruel policy of Soviet dictator Stalin.

During the war, the Germans made repeated attempts through neutral countries and the International Committee of the Red Cross to reach mutual agreement on the treatment of prisoners by Germany and the USSR. As British historian Robert Conquest explains in his book Stalin: Breaker of Nations, *the Soviets adamantly refused to cooperate:*

> *When the Germans approached the Soviets, through Sweden, to negotiate observance of the provisions of the Geneva Convention on prisoners of war, Stalin refused. The Soviet soldiers in German hands were thus unprotected even in theory. Millions of them died in captivity, through malnutrition or maltreatment. If Stalin had adhered to the convention (to which the USSR had not been a party) would the Germans have behaved better? To judge by their treatment of other "Slav submen" POWs (like the Poles, even surrendering after the [1944] Warsaw Rising), the answer seems to be yes. (Stalin's own behavior to [Polish] prisoners captured by the Red Army had already been demonstrated at Katyn and elsewhere [where they were shot].*

Another historian, Nikolai Tolstoy, affirms in The Secret Betrayal:

> *Hitler himself urged Red Cross inspection of [German] camps [holding Soviet prisoners of war]. But an appeal to Stalin for prisoners' postal services received a reply that clinched the matter: "There are no Soviet prisoners of war. The Soviet soldier fights on till death. If he chooses to become a prisoner, he is automatically excluded from the Russian community. We are not interested in a postal service only for Germans."*

Given this situation, the German leaders resolved to treat Soviet prisoners no better than the Soviet leaders were treating the German soldiers they held. As can be imagined, Soviet treatment of German prisoners was harsh. Of an estimated three million German soldiers who fell into Soviet hands, more than two million perished in captivity. Of the 91,000 German troops captured in the Battle of Stalingrad, fewer than 6,000 ever returned to Germany.

As Teplyakov also explains here, Red Army "liberation" of the surviving Soviet prisoners in German camps brought no end to the suffering of these hapless men. It wasn't until recently, when long-suppressed Soviet wartime records began to come to light and long-silenced voices could at last speak out, that the full story of Stalin's treatment of Soviet prisoners became known. It wasn't until 1989, for example, that Stalin's grim Order No. 270 of August 16, 1941 — cited below — was first published.

"What is the most horrible thing about war?"

Marshal Ivan Bagramyan, three-time Hero of the Soviet Union Alexander Pokryshkin, and Private Nikolai Romanov, who has no battle orders or titles, all replied with just one word: "Captivity."

Yuri Teplyakov, born in 1937, studied journalism at Moscow State University. He worked as a journalist for the Moscow daily newspapers *Izvestia* and *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, and for the APN information agency. From 1980 to 1993 he worked for the weekly *Moscow News*. In writing this article, he expresses thanks to Mikhail Semir-yaga, D.Sc. (History), "who provided me with considerable material, which he found in German archives. As for the documents of Soviet filtering camps, I shall go on with my searches." This article originally appeared in *Moscow News*, No. 19, 1990, and is reprinted here by special arrangement.

"Is it more horrible than death?" I was asking soldier Nikolai Romanov a quarter of a century ago when, on the sacred day of May 9 [anniversary of the end of the war against Germany in 1945], we were drinking bitter vodka together to commemorate the souls of the Russian muzhiks who would never return to that orphaned village on the bank of the Volga.

"It's more horrible," he replied. "Death is your own lot. But if it's captivity, it spells trouble for many . . ."

Captured during the great military victories in the first months of Hitler's "Barbarossa" offensive against the Soviet Union, seemingly endless columns of Red Army prisoners such as these are marched to captivity in German camps.

At that time, in 1965, I could not even vaguely imagine the extent of the tragedy which had befallen millions upon millions, nor did I know that that tragedy had been triggered by just a few lines from the Interior Service Regulations of the Workers' and Peasants' Red Army: a Soviet soldier must not be taken prisoner against his will. And if he has been, he is a traitor to the Motherland.

How many of them were there — those "traitors"?

"During the war years," I was told by Colonel Ivan Yaroshenko, Deputy Chief of the Central Archives of the USSR Ministry of Defense, in Podolsk near Moscow, "as many as 32 million people were soldiers, and 5,734,528 of them were taken prisoner by the enemy."

Later I learned where this happened and when. Thus, the Red Army suffered the most tragic losses in terms of prisoners of war in the following battles: Belostok-Minsk, August 1941, 323,000; Uman, August 1941, 103,000; Smolensk-Roslavl, August 1941, 348,000; Gomel, August 1941, 30,000; Demyansk, September 1941, 35,000; Kiev, September 1941, 665,000; Luga-Leningrad, September 1941, 20,000; Melitopol, October 1941, 100,000; Vyazma, October 1941, 662,000; Kerch, November 1941, 100,000; Izyum-Kharkov, May 1942, 207,000. People were taken prisoner even in February 1945 (Hungary), 100,000.

The same archives in Podolsk hold another 2.5 million cards "missing in action" — two and a half million who never returned home. Experts believe: two million of them are still lying in Russia's forests and marshes. And about 200,000 must be added to the list of POWs. Proof? From time to time the Podolsk archives receive a letter from somewhere in Australia or the United States: "I was taken prisoner. Request confirmation that I took part in battles against fascism."

This person was lucky — he survived. The majority, however, had a different lot. German statistics put it on record: 280,000 person died at deportation camps and 1,030,157 were executed when trying to escape or died at factories or mines in Germany.

Many of our officers and men were killed by famine before they reached the camps. Nearly 400,000 men died in November–December 1941 alone. During the entire war there were 235,473 British and American prisoners of war in Germany — 8,348 of them died. Were our men weaker? Hardly. The reasons were different. In the West it is believed that the millions of our POWs who died in captivity fell victim not only to fascism but also to the Stalinist system itself. At least half of those who died from hunger could have been saved had Stalin not called them traitors and refused to send food parcels to them via the International Red Cross.

It can be argued how many would have survived, but it's a fact that we left our POWs to the mercy of fate. The Soviet Union did not sign the Geneva Convention concerning the legal status of prisoners of war. Refusing to sign it was consistent with the Jesuitical nature of the "leader of the peoples."

From Stalin's point of view, several provisions of the Convention were incompatible with the moral and economic institutions which were inherent in the world's "freest country." The Convention, it

turns out, did not guarantee the right to POWs as working people: low wages, no days off, no fixed working hours. Exception was also taken to the privileges fixed for some groups of POWs. In other words it should be more humane. But greater hypocrisy can hardly be imagined. What privileges were enjoyed at that very same time by millions in [Soviet] GULAG prison camps? What guarantees existed there and how many days off did they have?

In August 1941 Hitler permitted a Red Cross delegation to visit the camp for Soviet POWs in Hammerstadt. It is these contacts that resulted in an appeal to the Soviet government, requesting that it should send food parcels for our officers and men. We are prepared to fulfill and comply with the norms of the Geneva convention, Moscow said in its reply, but sending food in the given situation and under fascist control is the same as making presents to the enemy.

The reply came as a surprise. The Red Cross representatives had not read Stalin's Order of the Day — Order No. 270, signed on August 16, 1941. Otherwise they would have understood how naive their requests and offers were, and how great was Stalin's hatred for those who had found themselves behind enemy lines.

It made no difference: who, where, how and why? Even the dead were considered to be criminals. Lt.-Gen. Vladimir Kachalov, we read in the order, "being in encirclement together with the headquarters of a body of troops, displayed cowardice and surrendered to the German fascists. The headquarters of Kachalov's groups broke out of the encirclement, the units of Kachalov's group battled their way out of the encirclement, but Lt.-Gen. Kachalov preferred to desert to the enemy."

General Vladimir Kachalov had been lying for 12 days in a burned out tank at the Starinka village near Smolensk, and never managed to break out to reach friendly forces. Yet this was of no concern for anyone. They were busy with something else — looking for scapegoats whom they could dump all of their anger on, looking for enemies of the people whose treachery and cowardice had again subverted the will of the great military leader.

We had to be "convinced" again and again: the top echelons of authority, the leaders, have no relation whatsoever to any tragedy, to any failure — be it the collapse of the first Five-Year Plan or the death of hundreds of thousands of soldiers on the Dnieper. Moreover, these misfortunes cannot have objective reasons either, being due solely to the intrigues of saboteurs and the enemies of the progressive system. For decades, ever since the 1930s, we have been permanently looking for scapegoats in the wrong place, but finding them nevertheless. At that time, in the first summer of the war, plenty of them were found. And the more the better. On June 4, 1940, the rank of general was re-established in the Red Army. They were awarded to 966 persons. More than 50 were taken prisoner in the very first year of the war. Very many of them would envy their colleagues — those 150 generals who would later die on the battlefields. The torments of captivity proved to be darker than the grave. At any rate the destinies of Generals Pavel Ponedelin and Nikolai Kirillov, mentioned in the same Order No. 270, prove that this is so. They staunchly withstood their years in the German camps. In April 1945 the [western] Allies set them free and turned them over to the Soviet side. It seemed that everything had been left behind, but they were not forgiven for August 1941. They were arrested after a "state check-up": five years in the Lefortovo jail for political prisoners and execution by a firing squad on August 25, 1950.

"Stalin's last tragic acts in his purging of the military were the accusations of betrayal and treachery he advanced in the summer of 1941 against the Western Front commanders, Pavlov and Klimovskikh, and several other generals among whom, as it became clear later, there were also people who behaved in an uncompromising way to the end when in captivity." This assessment is by the famous chronicler of the war, Konstantin Simonov. It appeared in the 1960s, but during the wartime ordeals there was indomitable faith: the prisoners of war (both generals and soldiers) were guilty. No other yardstick existed.

International law states that military captivity is not a crime, "a prisoner of war must be as inviolable as the sovereignty of a people, and as sacred as a misfortune." This is for others, whereas for us there was a different law — Stalin's Order No. 270.

> If . . . "instead of organizing resistance to the enemy, some Red Army men prefer to surrender, they shall be destroyed by all possible means, both ground-based and from the air, whereas the families of the Red Army men who have been taken prisoner shall be deprived of the state allowance [that is, rations] and relief."
>
> The commanders and political officers . . . "who surrender to the enemy shall be considered malicious deserters, whose families are liable to be arrested [just] as the families of deserters who have violated the oath and betrayed their Motherland."

Just a few lines, but they stand for the hundreds of thousands of children and old folks who died from hunger only because their father or son happened to be taken prisoner.

Just a few lines, but they amount to a verdict on those who never even thought of a crime, who were only waiting for a letter from the front.

Having read these lines, I came to understand the amount of grief they carried for absolutely innocent people, just as I understood the secret sorrow of the words Private Nikolai Romanov told me a quarter of a century ago: "Your own captivity spells trouble for many."

I understood why the most horrible thing for our soldiers was not to be killed, but to be reported "missing in action," and why before each battle, especially before the assault crossing of rivers, they asked one another: "Buddy, if I get drowned, say that you saw me die."

Setting their feet on a shaky pontoon and admitting, as it were, that they could be taken prisoner solely through their own fault, they mentally glanced back not out of fear for their own lives — they were tormented and worried over the lives of those who had stayed back at home.

Soviet prisoners of war in a German POW camp. This photograph was found by Red Army troops among the belongings of dead German soldiers.

But what was the fault of the hundreds of thousands of soldiers encircled near Vyazma when Hitler launched Operation *Taifun* — his advance on Moscow? "The most important thing is not to surrender your positions," the General Headquarters of the Supreme Commander-in-Chief ordered them. And the army was feverishly digging trenches facing the west, when panzer wedges were already enveloping them from the east.

General Franz Halder, Chief of Staff of the Wehrmacht's ground forces, made the following entry in his diary on this occasion: "October 4 — 105 days of the war. The enemy has continued everywhere holding the unattacked sectors of the front, with the result that deep envelopment of these enemy groups looms in the long term."

Who was supposed to see these wedges? A soldier from his tiny foxhole or Stalin from the GHQ? And what was the result? Who was taken prisoner? Who betrayed the Motherland? The soldier did.

In May 1942, as many as 207,047 officers and men (the latest figure) found themselves encircled at Kharkov. When Khrushchev held power, it was Stalin who was considered to be guilty of this. When Brezhnev took over, the blame was again put on Khrushchev who, incidentally, had been merely warned by Stalin for that defeat which opened the road for the Germans to the Volga. But who then betrayed the Motherland, who was taken prisoner? The soldier.

May 19, 1942, is the date of our army's catastrophe in the Crimea. "The Kerch Operation may be considered finished: 150,000 POWs and a large quantity of captured equipment." This is a document from the German side. And here is a document from the Soviet side cited by Konstantin Simonov: "I happened to be on the Kerch Peninsula in 1942. The reason for the humiliating defeat is clear to me. Complete mistrust of the army and front commanders, Mekhlis' stupid willfulness and arbitrary actions. He ordered that no trenches be dug, so as not to sap the soldiers' offensive spirit."

Stalin's closest aide and then Chief of the Main Political Administration (GPU), Lev Mekhlis, the first Commissar of the Army and Navy, returned to Moscow after that defeat. And what did the soldier do? The soldier stayed in captivity.

There is no denying that no war can do without treachery and traitors. They could also be found among POWs. But if compared with the millions of their brothers in captivity, they amounted to no more than a drop in the ocean. Yet this drop existed. There is no escaping this. Some were convinced by leaflets like this one:

> The Murderous Balance of Bolshevism:
> Killed during the years of the Revolution and Civil War — 2,200,000 persons.
> Died from famine and epidemics in 1918 – 1921 and in 1932–1933 — 14,500,000 persons.
> Perished in forced labor camps — 10,000,000 persons.

Some even put it this way: I am not going into action against my people, I am going into action against Stalin. But the majority joined fascist armed formations with only one hope: as soon as the first fighting starts, I'll cross the line to join friendly troops. Not everyone managed to do this, although the following fact is also well known. On September 14, 1943, when the results of the Kursk Battle were summed up, Hitler explained the defeat by the "treachery of auxiliary units": indeed, at that time 1,300 men — practically a whole regiment — deserted to the Red Army's side on the southern sector. "But now I am fed up with this," Hitler said. "I order these units to be disarmed immediately and this whole gang to be sent to the mines in France."

It has to be admitted that it was Hitler who rejected longer than all others the proposals to form military units from among Soviet POWs, although as early as September 1941 Colonel von Tresckow had drawn up a plan for building up a 200,000-strong Russian anti-Soviet army. It was only on the eve of the Stalingrad Battle, when prisoners of war already numbered millions, that the Führer gave his consent at last.

All in all, it became possible to form more than 180 units. Among them the number of Russian formations was 75; those formed from among Kuban,

Don and Terek Cossacks — 216; Turkistan and Tatar (from Tataria and the Crimean Tatars) — 42; Georgian — 11; peoples of the Northern Caucasus — 12; Azerbaijani — 13; Armenian — 8.

The numerical strength of these battalions by their national affiliation (data as of January 24, 1945) was the following: Latvians — 104,000; Tatars (Tataria) — 12,500, Crimean Tatars — 10,000; Estonians — 10,000; Armenians — 7,000; Kalmyks — 5,000. And the Russians? According to the official figures of Admiral Karl Dönitz's "government," as of May 20, 1945, there were the 599th Russian Brigade — 13,000, the 600th — 12,000, and the 650th — 18,000 men.

If all of this is put together (as we are doing now), it would seem that there were many who served on the other side. But if we remember that only 20 percent of these forces took part in hostilities, that they were recruited from among millions of POWs, that thousands upon thousands crossed the front line to return to friendly troops, the brilliance of the figures will clearly fade.

One detail — the Reich's special services displayed special concern over forming non-Russian battalions as if they knew that they would be required, especially after the war when whole peoples, from babies to senile old men, came to be accused of treachery. And it made no difference — whether you were kept in a prison camp or served in the army — all the same you were an enemy.

But the POWs themselves were not yet aware of this — everything still lay ahead. The hangover after liberation would set in a little later. Both for those who themselves escaped from the camps (500,000 in 1944, according to the estimate of Germany's Armaments Minister Speer) and for those who after liberation by Red Army units (more than a million officers and men) again fought in its ranks.

For too long a time we used to judge the spring of 1945 solely by the humane instructions issued by our formidable marshals — allot milk for Berlin's children, feed women and old men. It was strange reading those documents, and at the same time chewing steamed rye instead of bread, and eating soup made of dog meat (only shortly before her death did my grandmother confess she had slaughtered dogs to save us from hunger). Reading those orders, I was prepared to cry from tender emotions: how noble it was to think that way and to show such concern for the German people.

And who of us knew that at the same time the marshals received different orders from the Kremlin with respect to their own people?

> [To the] Commanders of the troops of the First and Second Byelorussian Fronts [Army Groups], and the First, Second, Third and Fourth Ukrainian Fronts . . .
>
> The Military Councils of the Fronts shall form camps in [rear-zone] service areas for the accommodation and maintenance of former prisoners of war and repatriated Soviet citizens — each camp for 10,000 persons. All in all, there shall be formed: at the Second Byelorussian Front — 15 [camps]; at the First Byelorussian Front — 30; at the First Ukrainian Front — 30; at the Fourth Ukrainian Front — 5; at the Second Ukrainian Front — 10; at the Third Ukrainian Front — 10 camps . . .
>
> The check-up [of the former prisoners of war and repatriated citizens] shall be entrusted as follows: former Red Army servicemen — to the bodies of SMERSH counter-intelligence; civilians — to the commissions of the NKVD, NKGB, SMERSH . . .
>
> J. Stalin

I phoned Col.-Gen. Dmitri Volkogonov, Chief of the Institute of Military History under the USSR Ministry of Defense [and author of *Stalin: Triumph and Tragedy*]: "Where did you find that order? Both at the State Security Committee and at the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs they told me that they had nothing of the kind."

"This one is from Stalin's personal archives. The camps existed, which means that there are also papers from which it is possible to learn everything: who, where, what they were fed, what they thought about. Most likely, the documents are in the system of the Ministry of Internal Affairs. The convoy troops were subordinate to this government department. It included the Administration for the Affairs of Former Prisoners of War. Make a search."

And search I did. Maj.-Gen. Pyotr Mishchenkov, First Deputy Chief of the present-day Main Administration for Corrective Affairs (GUID) at the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, was sincerely surprised: "This is the first I heard about this. I would be glad to help, but there is nothing I can do about it. I know that there was a colony in the Chunsky district of the Irkutsk Region. People got there after being checked up at the filtering camps mentioned in Stalin's order. They were all convicted under Article 58 — high treason."

One colony . . . Where are the others, what happened to their inmates? After all, as many as 100 camps were at work. The only thing I managed to find out — by October 1, 1945, they had "filtered" 5,200,000 Soviet citizens; 2,034,000 were turned over by the Allies — 98 percent of those who stayed in Germany's western occupation zones, mostly POWs. How many of them returned home? And how many went, in accordance with Order No. 270, into Soviet concentration camps? I don't yet have any authentic documents in my possession. Again only Western estimates and some eyewitness accounts.

I spoke to one such eyewitness on the Kolyma. A former "traitor to the Motherland," but then the accountant general of the Srednekan gold field, Viktor Masol, told me how in June 1942 in the Don



Many of the Soviet soldiers taken prisoner by the Germans during the 1941–1945 war volunteered to serve with the Germans in an ill-fated effort to liberate their homeland from Soviet tyranny. Altogether about a million Soviets volunteered to aid the Germans in overthrowing the regime that ruled their country — an act of disloyalty by a people toward its rulers without precedent in history.

In this photograph, Lt.-General Andrei A. Vlasov reviews troops of the German-sponsored "Russian Liberation Army." By the end of the war about 300,000 RLA soldiers were under Vlasov's command. Hundreds of thousands of other former Soviet soldiers of non-Russian nationality served in other German-sponsored anti-Communist military units. Vlasov was also chairman of the German-backed "Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia," which was proclaimed at a conference in Prague in 1944.

Before his capture by the Germans in July 1942, Vlasov was regarded as one of the most brilliant Red Army commanders. At the end of the war he surrendered to the Americans, who turned him over the Soviets. He was put to death in Moscow in 1946.

steppes after the Kharkov catastrophe they — unarmed, hungry, ragged Red Army men — were herded like sheep by German tanks into crowds of many thousands. Freight cars took them to Germany, where he mixed concrete for the Reich, and three years later they were sent in freight cars from Germany across the whole Soviet Union — as far as the Pacific Ocean. In the port of Vanino they were loaded into the holds of the *Felix Dzerzhinsky* steamship [named after the founder of the Soviet secret police], which had previously borne the name of *Nikolai Yezhov*, [a former] People's Commissar of Internal Affairs [that is, the NKVD or secret police], bound for Magadan. During the week they were on their way, they were given food only once — barrels with gray flour, covered with boiling water, were lowered through the hatch. And they, burning their hands and crushing one another, snatched this mess and stuffed it, choking, into their mouths: most often people go crazy with hunger. Those who died on the way were thrown overboard in the Nagayev Bay, the survivors marched into the taiga, again behind the barbed wire of — now — their native prison camps.

Just a few survived and returned. But even they were like lepers. Outcasts. How many times they heard: "Better a bullet through your head . . ."

Many former POWs thought about a bullet in

the 1940s–1950s. Both when they were reminded from the militia office — "you are two days overdue" (all the POWs were kept on a special register with mandatory reports on strictly definite days), and when people told them: "Keep silent. You whiled away your time in captivity on fascist grub . . ."

And they did keep silent.

In 1956, after Khrushchev's report, it became possible to speak about Stalin. Former POWs were no longer automatically enemies of the people, but not quite yet defenders of the Motherland. Something in between. On paper it was one way, but in life everything was different.

Two years ago, on the eve of V-Day, I interviewed Col.-Gen. Alexei Zheltov, Chairman of the Soviet War Veterans' Committee. As befits the occasion, he was telling me with tears in his eyes about the holiday, about a Soviet soldier, an accordion in his hands, in the streets of spring-time Vienna. And I don't know what made me ask him, well, and former prisoners of war, are they war veterans?

"No, they are not veterans. Don't you have anything else to write about? Look how many real soldiers we have . . ."

If Alexei Zheltov, the tried and tested veteran commissar, were the only one to think that way, that wouldn't be so bad. The trouble is that this philosophy is preached by the majority of the top brass. Both those who have long retired on pensions and who still hold command positions. For nearly 40 years we have been "orphaned," have lived without "the father of the peoples," but we sacredly revere his behests, sometimes not even noticing this ourselves.

Human blood is not water. But is has also proved to be a perfect conserving agent for Stalin's morality. It has become even thicker. It has not disappeared even after several generations. It lives on. And not infrequently it triumphs. Try and raise the problem of prisoners of war (even before me this theme was taken up on more than one occasion, so I'm no discoverer here) — the reaction is always the same: better talk about something else. And if you fail to heed a "piece of good advice," they may even start to threaten: "Don't you dare!"

To whom should one address his requests? To the government or the Supreme Soviet? What beautiful walls of the Kremlin should one knock on to demand that soldierly dignity be returned to former POWs, that their good name be restored?

Suppose your knocking has been heard. They will ask: what are you complaining about? What resolution do you take exception to? Oh, not a resolution. You are only worried over the past? How strange . . .

But it's even more strange that we still have real soldiers, real heros and real people, meaning that there are also those who are not real. To this day our life is still like a battle front: by force of habit, we continue putting people in slots — these on this side, others over there. There seems to be neither law nor Order No. 270 any longer, like there is no one and nothing to fight against, but all the same whatever was once called black may at best become only gray. But by no means white.

. . . May 9: the whole country cries and rejoices. Veterans don their medals and pour out wine, remembering their buddies. But even in this circle a former POW is the last to hold out his glass and the last to take the floor.

What then is to be done? What should we do to squeeze the Stalinoid slave out of ourselves?

A Video that Revises History —And Could Change the Course of It

Out of all the footage I brought back, nothing is more significant, or of more vital importance, than the interview I conducted in Poland with Dr. Franciszek Piper of the Auschwitz State Museum. He felt comfortable enough to talk with me for an hour in his office at Auschwitz. The result should keep people talking for quite some time. **–David Cole**

Equipped with a Super VHS camera, a microphone, a list of questions, and a sense of humor, Revisionist David Cole traveled to Auschwitz in September 1992 and produced a video of that trip that is, to put it mildly, *devastating*. Cole not only documents on tape the falsehoods told Auschwitz visitors every day by unknowing tour guides, he shows that the very people who run the museum aren't at all sure about their main attraction–the "gas chamber"!

Here is dramatic confirmation of what Revisionists have been saying about the Holocaust for more than 20 years, graphically presented on video so you can see and hear for yourself the tour guides and the museum's director, and examine the layout of the camp with its buildings and their surroundings. For those who cannot afford the trip to Europe to see all this for themselves, this video brings Auschwitz, as well as *The Leuchter Report*, to life right in your living room.

Most devastating of all is Cole's interview with Dr. Piper, in which the director of the Auschwitz Museum casually admits to postwar alterations of the room that for decades has been shown to tourists as an unaltered, "original state" gas chamber.

Professionally produced in full color and crisp sound, the tape runs just under an hour. If you've been waiting for a concise, intelligent, and persuasive presentation on the Holocaust that you can comfortably show to friends and family, *that video is here!* For those with no access to a video player, the soundtrack is available on C-60 audio cassette.

DAVID COLE INTERVIEWS
Dr. FRANCISZEK PIPER
VHS $49 (PAL format $59)
Price to *Journal* subscribers, $39 ($49 in PAL)
Audio cassette of the video soundtrack, $9.95
Add $2.50 for shipping • Cal. residents add 7.75% sales tax
Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739 • Newport Beach, CA 92659

Reflections of an American World War II Veteran on the Fiftieth Anniversary of the D-Day Invasion

CHARLES E. WEBER

Television stations throughout the United States recently devoted many hours to the events of the bloody "D-Day" battle half a century ago, broadcasting gruesome scenes recorded on thousands of feet of motion picture film. But what did that pain and sacrifice on the beaches of Normandy really bring for Americans?

I am an American veteran of the Second World War, born in 1922. I was sworn into the Army of the United States on January 13, 1943, and discharged from military service on a pleasant spring day in Heidelberg, April 13, 1946. During those three and a quarter years I went to places as I was ordered, and did what I was ordered to do. Since my overseas service was in Europe, my reflections of June 6, 1944, are mostly concerned with the American military role in Europe. When I view the film footage of American "D-Day" military action, I realize how fortunate I am not to have been on the "Omaha" beachhead sector that day.

After the end of military action in 1945, I became involved in the process usually called "Denazification," which afforded me the unusual opportunity to hear views from both sides of the war. My training had been in military intelligence, and my Military Occupational Specialty Number was 631, that of an intelligence non-commissioned officer.

Opposing the American military forces that invaded Europe in June 1944 were men of my race, in fact exclusively of my race, from various parts of Europe, a Europe that had been exhausted by nearly five years of war. At the time the United States was closely allied with the most destructive tyranny that has ever existed in the history of mankind. Men from many lands were opposing the advance of Communism into Europe: Finns, Germans, Hungarians, Italians, Romanians, Slovaks and Croatians, as well as nearly a million volunteers from the Netherlands, Belgium, France, Denmark, Norway, and other countries. These volunteers included some of the finest and most courageous men of all the combatants, not only in terms of their military feats, but also because in many cases their governments, some of which had fled into exile, disowned them and later tried many of them as traitors for idealistically defending Europe against the armed forces of Communism.

In the years since the end of the Second World War, a number of courageous historians have been reevaluating the history of that conflict, including the American role. A notable, early example is the 1951 book by American intelligence officer Col. John Beaty, *The Iron Curtain Over America* [available through the IHR]. A recent and quite disturbing book by Canadian journalist James Bacque, *Other Losses* (1989) [available from the IHR], deals with the ruthless American treatment of Germans who laid down their arms in 1945. Scores of other important books in this category have also been published. In spite of a flood of continuing propaganda by the mass media, which present the history of American involvement in that conflict as the "Good War," historians such as Beaty and Bacque have had the courage and intellectual integrity to delve objectively into the darker realities of America's role in the conflict.

On September 1, 1939, German forces, wisely or not, attempted to regain by arms parts of Germany that had been forcibly taken by Poland in 1919–1920. Three days later this conflict between Germany and an overconfident Poland was expanded into a world war when a heavily armed and overconfident Britain, together with a somewhat hesitant France (which considered itself well protected behind an impressive line of modern fortifications) declared war against Germany.

While the motives for these fateful declarations were complex, British fear of German competition for export markets, at a time of lingering massive unemployment in Britain, was unquestionably a prominent factor. On that same day — September 3,

---

Charles E. Weber earned his Ph.D. in German literature at the University of Cincinnati (1954), and has taught at the University of Cincinnati, the University of Missouri, Louisiana State University, and the University of Tulsa (Oklahoma). He has served as Head of the Department of Modern Languages at the University of Tulsa. Dr. Weber (no relation of this *Journal*'s editor) is the author of *The 'Holocaust': 120 Questions and Answers*, and is chairman of the Committee for the Reexamination of the History of the Second World War. He is a member of this *Journal*'s Editorial Advisory Committee.

British premier Churchill, American President Roosevelt and Soviet premier Stalin, along with high-ranking military officers, meet at the February 1945 Yalta Conference of Allied coalition leaders.

1939 — another significant event took place about which nearly all Americans are ignorant: a mass murder of civilian ethnic Germans by Poles, known as the "Bromberg Bloody Sunday." This event, which the German government quickly publicized in newspapers and other publications, complete with grim photographs, lent the conflict a grim and desperate atmosphere from the outset.

From Polish Foreign Office documents captured in Warsaw in 1939 by invading German forces, we know that President Franklin Roosevelt had been ordering his diplomats in Europe to help incite war in Europe, motivated at least in part by a desire to solve with war the still pressing problem of massive unemployment in the United States — even after six years in office. [See: M. Weber, "President Roosevelt's Campaign to Incite War In Europe," *JHR*, Summer 1983, pp. 135–172.] Well aware that the vast majority of Americans wanted no involvement in the war that raged in Europe (particularly after the outbreak of hostilities between Germany and the USSR in June 1941), the shrewdly duplicitous occupant of the White House assured the American people that he had no intention of sending their sons to fight on foreign battlefields. Among the citizens who played prominent roles in the popular campaign against American involvement in the war were Charles Lindbergh and Walt Disney.

On the basis of newly published histories of Soviet military units and secret documents, we know today that Stalin was planning a Soviet Russian invasion of central and western Europe in 1941. [See, in particular, the book *Icebreaker* by V. Suvorov.] Ordered into offensive positions in the spring and early summer of 1941 were massed Soviet armies that had powerful, modern tanks in numbers far greater than those under German command.

Following arrogant demands to German officials by Soviet diplomats in the autumn of 1940 (which previewed what Germany and indeed all of Europe could expect from a militarily victorious Soviet Union), and after Germany's political and military leaders became convinced that time and further delay were putting their nation at ever greater military disadvantage, Hitler ordered a mighty military offensive against the Soviet Union. This great strike, code-named "Operation Barbarossa," began on the morning of June 22, 1941. It met with astonishing initial successes against the Soviet forces that had been massed on the frontier for offensive (and not defensive) operations —

another instance of overconfidence. These initial German military victories took place in spite of inadequate preparations for a sustained offensive (including a shortage of clothing suitable for winter warfare).

Roosevelt had an intense personal hatred of Hitler, who had, in some important ways, been far more successful in solving the great economic problems that afflicted both the United States and Germany. In contrast to Adolf Hitler, who had come from modest circumstances and who had served his nation in its armed forces as a front-line soldier who witnessed, first-hand, the horrors of war, Franklin Roosevelt had come from a very wealthy family and never served in combat. During 1940–41, and in spite of the overwhelming sentiment of the American people against military involvement in another European war, the United States, under Roosevelt's leadership, increasingly committed US armed forces and war supplies to military actions against Germany.

In a lengthy speech delivered on December 11, 1941 — just a few days after the Japanese attack on Hawaii — Hitler finally recognized that Roosevelt's duplicitous efforts had won out, and declared the existence of a state of war with the United States. [Complete text of Hitler's speech published in the *JHR*, Winter 1988, pp. 389–416.] Without such a formal declaration by Hitler, the full force of American military and industrial power against Germany might have been delayed for months or even years. Hitler had underestimated the sentiment of the American people to keep out of the European war. When one reads the text of this speech today, it becomes apparent that the German leader had become emotionally moved by American military attacks against German naval forces in the Atlantic. Japan's attack against Pearl Harbor several days earlier served to realize Roosevelt's desire for full American involvement in war, and made his political position virtually unassailable.

Soaked with the blood of young American men, the Normandy beaches are a symbol of American sacrifices in a war that produced results that caused many thoughtful Americans to later ask themselves what the bitter sacrifices had really brought. For more than four decades eastern and much of central Europe suffered under a brutal, exploitative Soviet occupation. During 1945–1946, brutal expulsions of millions of ethnic Germans from areas that had been part of Germany for centuries resulted in the deaths of many hundreds of thousands. By the start of the Soviet blockade of Berlin in June 1948, many Americans were asking themselves what we had done as a nation.

I was still in Europe during the summer of 1948, having taken a position with the War Department following my discharge from the Army. That summer was a time of great tension and fear that a new war might break out, this time in a military vacuum that likely would have resulted in the rather sudden defeat of whatever western military forces were still left in Europe, and the subsequent Soviet occupation of the portion of Europe that had not already been occupied by Soviet forces.

We Americans can be proud that our Constitution forbids "ex post facto" laws, in keeping with thousands of years of European legal tradition expressed, for example, in the ancient Latin legal dictum, "nulla poena sine lege" ("no punishment without a law"). One day in the summer of 1946 I attended the protracted show trials in Nuremberg of German leaders who had been obeying the laws of their country, and defending it against ruthless foes who had made genocidal threats — such as the notorious "Morgenthau Plan" — against the German nation. [See: A. Kubek, "The Morgenthau Plan and the Problem of Policy Perversion," *JHR*, Fall 1989.] The Nuremberg trials were a cynical repudiation of American legal principles, against which some courageous Americans — including Senators Robert Taft and Joseph McCarthy — raised their voices at the time.

These trials, with their cynical disregard of American and European legal principles (similar to present efforts in some European countries to suppress open inquiry into some taboo historical questions), can be seen as a sort of psychological necessity for many Americans, who had come to realize what their country had done in Europe. The trials served to help rationalize or morally justify our conduct of the war, including the merciless and largely unnecessary bombing of German and other civilian populations (such as the fire-bombing of Dresden in February 1945). Largely unknown to most Americans at the time was the disgraceful American postwar treatment of German prisoners of war, and the barbaric "Operation Keelhaul" treatment of eastern Europeans. Such actions were not worthy of a nation that claimed to be guided by Christian moral principles. But war seems to have the ability to "hallow any cause," to use Nietzsche's phrase.

The Second World War also served as the perfect pretext for the establishment of Big Government, with its gigantic and intrusive federal bureaucracy. (For example, the payroll deduction system that was introduced as a temporary "war measure" has remained permanent.)

The young men who served in the air forces of Britain, Germany and the United States during the Second World War were, physically and mentally, the finest examples of their race. Fighting each other, they died by the scores of thousands in the gun fire of aerial combat and in the flaming wreckage of downed aircraft. In most cases their genes were lost forever — a striking example of the dysgenic effect of modern warfare.

Far more insidious and perhaps far more damaging, I believe, has been the psychological conse-

quence of America's involvement in the Second World War. The well-calculated propaganda image of America's "victory" in 1945 and the subsequent Nuremberg trials, along with the "Holocaust" campaign, have served to help poison and debilitate the psyche and even the will to survive of Americans of European ancestry. In one law after the other, in one judicial decree after the other, and in one foreign policy decision after the other, this poison and debilitation have manifested themselves. During the past few decades the political and cultural standing of European-Americans has been steadily declining.

However great his faults, or misguided his actions, Hitler's basic aim — the welfare of his own people, race and culture — was, I think, valid. A consequence of the constant denigration in the American popular media of Hitler and his regime is to discredit the pursuit of any similar aim by European-Americans. Any defense of European-American interests has become not only unfashionable, but is now widely regarded as immoral.

It seems especially ironic that a man who slyly and selfishly evaded military service during the war in Vietnam, and whose past personal behavior is a source of shame to our country, should be the one to represent the United States in commemorating the sacrifices made by American soldiers on the beaches of Normandy and in central Italy.

It is proper that we honor the well-intended sacrifices of American soldiers who were killed and wounded during the Second World War. At the same time, though, we must also keep the results of these sacrifices in proper perspective, especially with regard to the long-range results of the war.

Bitter Retrospective after Fifty Years

Open Letter from a Young Frenchman to a Former French Resistance Fighter

First of all, I hope you were not one of those who waited until every German had fled before putting on the insignia of the French Forces of the Interior [the resistance movement]. If you really fought the Germans I respect you because I oppose all occupation forces. I can well imagine how those grey-green uniforms, that accent from beyond the Rhine, and those virile marching songs would have been intolerable to you. You may well even tell me that you despise the music of Wagner, that you hate sauerkraut and everything about German culture. You did what you felt you had to do to resist the imposition of an alien presence and an alien culture.

But you, who resisted the other because he was

Because their lovers had been Germans, these young French woman were publicly humiliated by having their heads shaved.

German, who refused the "enrichment" of Teutonic ideas, who fought and suffered so that France would remain French, tell me this: How can you accept the waves of Africans and Asians now washing up on our shores? They leave their spray-paint spoor on our walls and on our trains and buses. Where they have become the majority, their habits make life intolerable for Frenchmen — Frenchmen who watch their neighborhoods decay and then flee.

With the help of their collaborators in the government and the media, these newcomers are trying to impose their culture on us. Today we see mosques rising everywhere and instead of the German music of your era, we hear such tropical brayings as rap, the Lambada, and Saga Africa. You — who shaved the heads of French women who succumbed to the charms of German soldiers — what do you think today when you see white women walking hand and hand with blacks and Arabs?

Every day you are harangued by radio and television about the joys of racial mixing. You hear the government-sponsored calls to childless French couples to adopt third-world children. And all the while, your taxes rise because you must pay your part of a 240 billion [French Francs] social welfare budget that is really the annual cost of occupation.

You risked your life to rid France of German culture, but I ask you candidly: Was it worth the trouble? What have we gained, now that those field-grey uniforms have been replaced with saris, djellabahs [the costume of Morocco] and boubous [traditional African costume]?

You were lucky in a way. If today's "anti-racist" laws had been in effect in July 1940, you could have been indicted and imprisoned for "inciting hatred

against Germans" with the very first tract you handed out.

What Was the Point?

What was the point of killing so many people only to get where we are now? It could all have been avoided. Around 1942, François Mitterand [former resistance leader, now President of France] could have said "The Germans are at home in our homes" [a phrase widely promoted today about immigrants], and Pierre Laval [vice-premier of France's wartime pro-German Vichy government, and executed in 1945] would have agreed. If you and Mitterand hadn't been so intolerant and Germanophobic we could have easily assimilated the million or so Germans who were camping on our soil.

Couldn't they have been naturalized, given the vote, and made into good little Frenchmen like you and me? Wouldn't that have been an earlier version of the "cultural enrichment," "tolerance," and "openness to others," about which we hear so much these days? You may not like to admit it, but I know you prefer Bavarian polkas to that execrable rap "music."

Poor old boy, the people who sent you off to the wars in 1940 have certainly made a monkey out of you. Since then, neither Gaullists nor Communists have done much to preserve our people or our culture, have they? Your silence is the silence of a cuckold, but I feel your quiet rage at having been so cruelly deceived.

At your age perhaps we cannot expect to find you at our side in the fight against this generation's occupation. But surely you will not be displeased to see the rising power of the anti-immigration movement and of those who wish to preserve the France for which you fought. For it is we who now fight to justify your sacrifice, whose victory will ensure that the comrades you left upon the field of honor did not die in vain.

This essay is reprinted from the July 1994 issue of American Renaissance *newsletter (P. O. Box 1674, Louisville, KY 40201). It originally appeared in issue No. 19 of the French periodical,* l'Empire Invisible.

If history were an exact science, we would be able to foretell the future of nations. We cannot, though, because the science of history always clashes with the mystery of personality. It is men, personalities, who make history.

— Heinrich von Treitschke

American Troops Liberate Dachau, April 1945

DACHAU
Reality and Myth

When American GIs liberated the infamous Dachau concentration camp on April 29, 1945, they were horrified by the corpses they found there, and readily believed stories of mass killings in a camp "gas chamber." As John Cobden explains in this easy to read overview, the real story of the camp is quite different than the widely accepted legend.

Few know, for example, that even after the American's took over Dachau, prisoners continued to die in large numbers–nearly ten percent of all deaths at the camp took place after liberation.

Over the years, former Dachau inmates have told "eyewitness" stories of terrible atrocities committed in the camp, including "gas chamber" killings of thousands of prisoners.

In ***Dachau: Reality and Myth***, however, these tales disintegrate under close examination. Cutting through a fog of confusion, deception and politics, here is the true story of Dachau, including how the "official" history of the Third Reich's first and best-known concentration camp has changed dramatically over the years. Written with passionate devotion to truth and sensitivity for the suffering of the camp's victims, ***Dachau: Reality and Myth*** systematically debunks a major historical legend.

Dachau: Reality and Myth
by John Cobden
52 pages • Photos • ISBN: 0-939484-49-8
$6 postpaid
Two or more copies $4.50 each postpaid

—Published by—
Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739 • Newport Beach, CA 92659

Revisionist Historians and Activists To Meet for Twelfth IHR Conference

From across the United States and several foreign countries, scholars, activists and friends of the Institute for Historical Review will meet over the September 3–5 weekend in southern California for the IHR's Twelfth International Revisionist Conference.

As announced in the May-June *Journal*, this forthcoming Conference will feature some of the most prominent figures in the growing international revisionist movement. A lot has happened since the Eleventh IHR Conference in October 1990, and leading activists will be on hand to provide attendees with the exciting inside story about the major breakthroughs, as well as the formidable new efforts of our enemies, in the international campaign for greater historical awareness about the most hyped and taboo-laden chapter of history. In addition, leading revisionist scholars will report on the new documentary and investigatory discoveries that further shatter the icons of "official" history.

In his typically riveting and entertaining style, best-selling British historian **David Irving** will present startling new facts and insights about Joseph Goebbels, based in part on his headline-making investigation in Russian archives of the Third Reich propaganda chief's long-hidden personal diaries. Irving, one of the world's most prolific historians, will also update attendees on the ever more frantic international campaign to muzzle him — and all others who dare to defy the powerful worldwide Holocaust lobby.



Dr. Robert Faurisson

From Canada, German-born publicist and civil rights activist **Ernst Zündel** will report on his courageous international campaign for greater awareness of suppressed history, and to restore the honor and good reputation of the German people. He'll talk about his publishing work and media activism, including the inside story on his March appearance on the popular "60 Minutes" public affairs television show, and his newly organized international television and radio broadcast outreach campaign. Zündel will review the impact and significance of his two widely publicized "Holocaust trials" (1985 and 1988), which brought major breakthroughs for historical revisionism and an important victory for free speech in Canada.

Robert Faurisson, Europe's leading Holocaust revisionist scholar and a much-appreciated IHR Conference speaker, will return to delight attendees with another fascinating and witty presentation. He will speak about the significance of revealing documents about Auschwitz and other German camps unearthed after years of suppression from Russian archives.

It was this French university professor (and frequent *Journal* contributor) who first dug up and published key documents from the Auschwitz construction department archives. After attempting for years to ignore this evidence, Faurisson's hard-pressed enemies are now obliged to offer confused responses. He will also report on the very oppressive situation in his native France, where it is a crime publicly to challenge the currently fashionable view of the Holocaust extermination story.

Carlo Mattogno

Carlo Mattogno, Italy's foremost revisionist scholar, will speak about his recent eye-opening research into the Holocaust story, emphasizing what newly uncovered records show about fraudulent Auschwitz extermination claims. A meticulous researcher with an impressive command of languages, Mattogno is the author of several books in Italian, and of numerous scholarly essays in English that have appeared over the years in this *Journal* — including the text of his presentation the Ninth IHR Conference (1989). Copies of *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend: A Critique of J. C. Pressac*, an impressive and detailed study just published by the IHR, will be available for sale. The author will gladly autograph copies.

Jürgen Graf, a Swiss educator and author of several carefully researched revisionist books on the Holocaust story, will speak about the perverse role that the Holocaust story has come to play in Western society.

In March 1993, following the publication of his 112-page book *Der Holocaust auf dem Prüfstand* ("The Holocaust on the Test Stand"), Graf was summarily dismissed from his post as a secondary school teacher of Latin and French, in spite of support from his students and colleagues. His firing came on orders of high-level Swiss authorities. Graf is also author of *Der Holocaust-Schwindel* (in German), *L'Holocaust au Scanner* (in French), and, most

recently, *Auschwitz: Tätergeständnisse und Augenzeugen des Holocaust* ("Auschwitz: Admissions by perpetrators and eyewitnesses of the Holocaust"). For more about Graf, see the Sept.-Oct. 1993 *Journal*, pp. 36–37.

John Ball will speak about his research and evaluation of little-known wartime aerial photography, providing devastating new insights into the suppressed history of Auschwitz and other alleged German death camps. Ball, a mineral exploration geologist from western Canada, has gathered, studied, and published scores of long suppressed aerial reconnaissance photographs of German camps. His analysis of these photos sheds new light on what actually did and didn't happen at these camps, providing valuable new data and insights against the Holocaust extermination story. He will illustrate his presentation with slides of wartime aerial photos.

IHR editor **Ted O'Keefe** will dedicate the Twelfth IHR Conference to the memory of American historian and journalist William Henry Chamberlin. **Greg Raven**, Associate Editor of the *Journal*, will serve as this year's Master of Ceremonies. *Journal* Editor **Mark Weber** will deliver the keynote address, summing up IHR and revisionism's achievements since the previous conference, and outlining present and future challenges. Institute Director **Tom Marcellus** will report to attendees on IHR business and organizational development since the Eleventh Conference in 1992.

This year's **Mystery Speaker** is a highly qualified technician from Europe whose study of the alleged mass-murder "gas chambers" at Auschwitz confirms that these facilities were not and could not have been used to kill people as claimed. His findings corroborate and strengthen the results of earlier investigations, including those of American gas chamber expert Fred Leuchter.



Jürgen Graf

David Cole, the youthful Jewish filmmaker who has proven himself an effective spokesman for the revisionist view in several nationally-broadcast television appearances, and who delighted attendees at the IHR's Eleventh Conference, will preview his promising second video about alleged wartime German killing facilities. In his first blockbuster revisionist video, the curator of the Auschwitz State Museum admitted to Cole on film that the "gas chamber" shown to tourists there is actually a post-war reconstruction.

Bradley Smith, America's most prominent revisionist activist, will report on his successful headline-making campaign, in defiance of malicious smears and ADL censorship, to bring revisionist facts and arguments to students and professors by placing advertisements in student papers across the United States. Smith — who is Director of the Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH), and longtime head of the IHR's Media Project — will also report on his recent national media breakthroughs, including an appearance (with David Cole) in March as a guest on the "Donahue Show." **Dr. Robert Countess,** a former college-level instructor in history and an IHR Editorial Advisor, will update attendees on his revisionist activities since the last Conference.

Schedule Changes

Regrettably, several persons who had been announced as Conference speakers in the May-June *Journal* will not be able to participate after all. These are: Fred Leuchter, Prof. H. W. Koch, Prof. Tony Martin and Michael Shermer. Two speakers — Carlo Mattogno and Jürgen Graf — have not been previously announced.

A Memorable Occasion

As those who have attended previous gatherings can attest, an IHR Conference is an informative, inspiring and enjoyable occasion. This Twelfth IHR Conference promises to be one of the most memorable ever.

While audio tapes and videotapes of this forthcoming IHR Conference will be available for sale, as usual, nothing matches the opportunity to see, hear, and meet personally with revisionist scholars and activists from around the world, the courageous individuals who lead the international crusade for truth about the most distorted aspects of twentieth century history.

Bradley Smith (left) and Phil Donahue (right) listen as David Cole makes a point during their March appearance on the widely viewed "Donahue" television show.

Bradley Smith's "Campus Project" Generates Nationwide Publicity for Holocaust Revisionism

Unprecedented Media Coverage of Holocaust "Open Debate" Campaign

During the past year Bradley Smith — America's most prominent revisionist activist, and a good friend of the Institute for Historical Review — has succeeded in generating unprecedented nationwide publicity for Holocaust revisionism as part of his "Campus Project." Defying a well-organized campaign of threats, intimidation and smears, he and his Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH) have placed more advertisements in student newspapers across the United States than during any other school year. On campus after campus, the ads have provoked enormous publicity, while the resulting furor has generated news reports and commentary in newspapers, magazines and television and radio broadcasts across the country.

Smith had already attracted nationwide notoriety during the 1991-92 school year by placing advertisements or statements calling for open debate on the Holocaust issue in 17 student newspapers, several at major universities. After something of a lapse during the 1992-93 school year — which prompted adversaries to boast that he had been permanently silenced — Smith came back, more effective than ever. During the 1993-94 school year, his ad — the most recent version of which is headed "A Revisionist Challenge to the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum" — was published, in one form or another, in at least 35 college and university student papers, as well as in one major metropolitan daily.

Brandeis University Uproar

Nowhere was the reaction to the appearance of Smith's CODOH advertisement more intense than at Brandeis University (Waltham, Mass.). Hundreds of members of the school's predominantly Jewish student body rallied to protest the ad, which appeared in the December 7 issue of the weekly *Justice*. Some 2,000 copies of the student paper were stolen as they were about to be distributed. Two days later, 4,000 replacement copies were delivered under protection of campus police.

Brandeis Professor and Holocaust historian Antony Polonsky told participants at a Dec. 9 campus rally: "Holocaust denial is not a serious scholarly debate. This is a new form of hate propaganda. This is not a First Amendment issue." Echoing this view was the *Boston Globe* (editorial, Dec. 14), and Kenneth S. Stern and Jeffrey Ross of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) in a letter published in *The New York Times* (Dec. 23).

At a panel discussion on "Holocaust Revision, Holocaust Denial," Brandeis Professor Jerry Cohen took a somewhat different view. (*Justice*, Feb. 15) Said Cohen:

> To simply stipulate facts and insist upon them with an attitude of "I shall not debate, I shall not confront, I shall not discuss lest I give dignity to absurd arguments in a world of absurd arguments" is, I think, a failed strategy . . . All historical events are subject to reinterpretation. As we move further and further away from these events, our perspective changes . . . not only because our interpretation changes, but also because more evidence comes to light.

As a result of his decision to run Smith's ad, *Justice* editor David Turner "became a pariah on campus." His car was defaced, he received hateful phone calls around the clock, and he was threatened with bodily harm. (*Time* magazine, Dec. 27.)

Queens College Bigotry

The text of the Smith's ad appeared in the student paper of Queens College (Flushing, New York) along with a barrage of smears and bigoted commentary. The ad text was printed on the front page of the *QC Quad*, February 21, under the heading "An Illustration of Hate." (Smith's check was returned, and the CODOH address was deleted from the ad.)

Right next to Smith's text appeared a viciously critical front-page editorial entitled "Revising Revisionism," which told readers that "the *Quad* wants to warn you that the adjoining material is hazardous to your head." Page two of this same issue was entirely devoted to a full-page letter from Queens College president Shirley Strum Kenny, which likewise attacked Smith while not citing even a single instance of what she called his "disregard for truth."

A second *Quad* editorial in this same issue, headed "A Man and His Lies," sought to discredit Smith by attributing to him racist statements sup-

posedly made in a 1989 interview with the University of Nebraska *Sower*. For example, Smith was quoted as expressing concern that America is becoming a "Mexicanized" country. In fact, Smith never made the statements attributed to him by the *Quad*, and was never even interviewed by the *Sower*. Smith's wife of 16 years is an immigrant from Mexico.

Further attacks against Smith appeared on five other pages of this same Feb. 21 issue of the *QC Quad*, as well as in the two succeeding issues of Feb. 28 and March 7.

All this generated reports and commentary in off-campus media, including a rather detailed article in the Feb. 10 Long Island *Newsday*, an editorial in the Feb. 12 *New York Post*, and an item in the *Jewish Week* of Feb. 18-24. Moreover, *Quad* executive editor Dave Konig was on hand for the March taping of the "Phil Donahue Show," on which revi-

Bradley Smith reports on his work at the Eleventh IHR Conference.

sionists Smith and David Cole were guests, when he was permitted by the host to disparage Smith in person.

Humboldt State University

The publication of Smith's ad in the March 16 issue of the Humboldt State University (Arcata, Calif.) *Lumberjack* generated letters arguing each side of the issue, which appeared through the April 13 issue. Some of the letters protesting the ad were written by HSU professors, to which geology senior Stephen Tillinghast responded (April 13): "I was disappointed to see these types of letters from professors on campus; surely they see the dangers of intolerance." The local daily *Eureka Times Standard* (March 24) also covered the controversy.

Miami University

At Miami University (Coral Gables, Florida), the publication of Smith's CODOH advertisement in the April 12 issue of *The Miami Hurricane* set off a furor that received national media attention. A wealthy Jewish businessman — Sanford L. Ziff, founder of the Sunglass Hut chain — was so upset by the ad's appearance there that he cancelled a scheduled $1 million donation to the school's Lowe Art Museum expansion project, and a $1 million gift to the school's Sylvester Cancer Research Center. Ziff reportedly was also having doubts about naming the University in his will as beneficiary for several additional millions of dollars.

Florida's leading daily, *The Miami Herald*, devoted considerable attention to the ad controversy at Miami University. (Its coverage began even before the ad appeared in the student paper there.) Reports about the Miami University uproar also appeared in the Palm Beach *Post*, the St. Petersburg *Times*, the *Tampa Tribune*, *USA Today* (April 13), the *New York Post*, and *The Washington Post*.

An Unusual Punishment

At Georgetown University (Washington, DC), Smith's ad appeared in the student paper, the *Georgetown Voice*, on October 14. University officials decided to treat publication of the ad as a serious transgression. The University's media board required the *Voice* to print an apology and donate the $200 paid for the ad to the federal government's US Holocaust Memorial Museum. Finally, the board ordered the three paper's top editors to tour the Holocaust Museum, escorted by a Georgetown professor of theology.

Other Papers

A report on the success of Smith's CODOH campaign between September and early November appeared in the Nov.-Dec. 1993 *Journal* (p. 22). In addition to the papers and schools noted in that article and elsewhere in this one, Smith's ad appeared in student papers at Wright State University (Dayton, Ohio) Oct. 28; Mount Hood Community College (Portland, Ore.), Oct. 29; Roosevelt High School (Portland, Ore.), in October; University of Notre Dame, Nov. 18; Bowling Green University (Ohio), Nov. 18; Boston College, Dec. 6; the University of Maryland, Jan. 27; Pennsylvania State University, Feb. 2; the University of Rhode Island, Feb. 4; California State University at Chico, March 9; San Jose State University, March 9; Humboldt State University (Arcata, Calif.), March 16; American River College (Calif.), March 17; Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, April 7; State

University of New York (SUNY) College, Oneonta, April 14; Trenton State University, April 14; Wheaton College (Mass.), April 14; Manhattan College (New York), April 14; State University of New York (SUNY), Buffalo, April 15; State University of New York (SUNY), Binghamton, April 15; Clemson University (South Carolina), April 16; Columbia College (Chicago), April 18; State University of New York (SUNY) College, Potsdam, April 19; Central Florida University, April 20; University of Maine (Orono), April 20; Hofstra University (Hempstead, New York), April 21; and, State University of New York (SUNY), Stony Brook, June 6.

In addition, Smith's ad also appeared for the first time in a major metropolitan daily, the Portland *Oregonian* (Oct. 24), the state's most widely read newspaper.

Rejection Publicity and Media Distortion

Even where it was turned down, news of the decision to reject Smith's ad sometimes generated considerable public interest and discussion. At Georgia State University, for example, the editors' decision to turn down the CODOH ad resulted in pages of commentary, both for and against publication, in the GSU student paper, *Signal*, between February 22 and April 19. Similarly, the decision to reject the ad by the student paper at the University of Buffalo resulted in a news story in the *Buffalo News* (April 16).

Another periodical that turned down Smith's ad was *The Skidmore News*, a paper that calls itself "the campus authority since 1925," and is apparently distributed to students at colleges and universities across the country. Nevertheless, this paper devoted an editorial and a 16-page Special Supplement (April 21), entitled "Why are Holocaust deniers targeting college campuses?," which contained the usual half-truths and smears.

A good example of how *The Skidmore News* brazenly twisted the truth is this assertion:

> Mr. Smith heads up the best-financed and most anti-Semitic propaganda organization in the country, Liberty Lobby. His newsletter published by the Institute for Historical Review is read by thousands across the country.

A *Skidmore News* essay by Prof. Robert Boyers, while highly critical of Smith and Holocaust revisionism, concluded with a gratifyingly strong support for the principle of free speech and a free press, even on this emotion-laden topic. Wrote Boyers:

> I do not observe in the current "revisionist" ad the tenor I associate with a murderous intention . . . Though it may seem tempting to censor or deny publication to ads that are empty or pointless or otherwise distasteful, many of us would argue that most ads — and many "news" features — are equally distasteful, or misleading, or dangerously manipulative. As long as the paid "revisionist" ads do not contain openly vicious, defamatory or incendiary messages, I would continue to support the decision of college newspapers to publish them.

Gas Chamber Evidence?

Holocaust historian Raul Hilberg, author of *The Destruction of the European Jews*, was asked by the *Skidmore News* about evidence "for the existence of [execution] gas chambers" in the German wartime German camps. Hilberg responded by citing the following:

- "Blueprints" from the Auschwitz construction office. In fact, these are clearly blueprints of crematory buildings and morgue rooms;
- "Aerial photography" from Auschwitz in 1944. In reality, these show no evidence whatever of "gassings" or killings of any kind;
- "Collateral documents which speak about the supply of gas." These are simply records of purchases and deliveries of the commercial pesticide Zyklon B;
- "Remains of these gas chambers," which were simply crematory buildings and morgue rooms; and,
- "Testimony," the dubiousness of which every serious historian is aware.

Finally, Hilberg claimed that "the [German] perpetrators, as a matter of fact, never denied it." Actually, a wide range of top-level German officials — including Hermann Göring and Albert Speer — strenuously rejected knowing of any wartime extermination program, or of gas chamber killings.

Further Publicity

It was the Brandeis controversy that prompted a full-page *Time* magazine article (Dec. 27), as well as a nationally distributed Associated Press report (which appeared, for example, in *The New York Times*, Dec. 12). The slanted *Time* report included a color photo of Smith at his home in Visalia, California, and a snide reference to the Institute for Historical Review and IHR *Journal* editor Mark Weber.

Reports also appeared in The *Philadelphia Inquirer* (Dec. 26), the Philadelphia *Jewish Times* (Dec. 30), and the *College Reporter* of Franklin & Marshall College (Jan. 17), although, typically, none of these addressed the specifics of Smith's ad.

Publication of Smith's ad in the Georgetown University paper prompted William Buckley to comment in his nationally-syndicated column (published, for example, in *National Review*, Jan. 24). Buckley, a fixture of New York City's pro-Zionist neo-conservative circles, dealt sarcastically with Smith and his campaign, and expressed satisfaction with the unusual way the university punished the offending editors.

An essay by Smith appeared as a guest editorial piece in the December 10 issue of the *Albany Student Press*, published at the State University of New

You have a right to know the facts!

A REVISIONIST CHALLENGE TO THE U.S. HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM

By Bradley R. Smith

This ad does not claim "the Holocaust never happened." Those who say it does want to muddy the issue. This is what the ad does claim: The U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum displays no proof whatever of homicidal gassing chambers, and no proof that even one individual was "gassed" in a German program of "genocide."

The question, then, is not, "Did the Holocaust happen?" The question is: If there were no gas chambers, *what was the Holocaust?*

This Museum promotes the charge that the Germans murdered the Jews of Europe in homicidal gassing chambers. It therefore has a *moral obligation* to demonstrate that the charge is true. Those who contend it is more important to be sensitive than truthful about whether the gas chambers truly existed are enemies of intellectual freedom and of the university itself.

What are the facts?

The Museum's "proof" for a gas chamber at Birkenau is a plastic model created by a Polish *artiste*. A plastic copy of a metal door is displayed as "proof" of a homicidal gas chamber at Maidanek. And, incredibly, the Museum has simply dropped the Auschwitz gas chamber, the basement room visited yearly by hundreds of thousands of tourists in Poland.

There is no mention of the alleged gas chambers at Buchenwald or even at Dachau, where after World War II American G.I.s and German civilians were assured that more than 200,000 victims were "gassed and burned."

The notion that eyewitness testimony, given under highly politicized and emotional circumstances, is *prima facie* true, was refuted by the Israeli Supreme Court when it acquitted John Demjanjuk of being "Ivan the Terrible." The Israeli Court found that the eyewitnesses who testified against Demjanjuk could not be believed!

Deborah Lipstadt argues in her much-praised *Denying the Holocaust* that revisionists ["deniers"] should not be debated because there can not be another side to the gas chamber stories. She charges that it is hateful to demand proof that the weapon allegedly used to commit horrendous acts of mass murder actually existed! She argues—in this one instance only—that we betray America's old civil virtues of free inquiry and open debate. For the benefit of whom?

I'm not in disagreement with Ms. Lipstadt and her *clique* on the gas chamber controversy because they may be Zionists or Jews. That's disingenuous. I'm in disagreement with her over the fact that she argues against "light of day," our understanding that in a free society *all* ideas are best illuminated in the "light" of open debate.

The Museum is so confident no one will challenge its gas-chamber gimcrackery that it even claims to have found a new "death camp" gas chamber. Proof? The uncorroborated story of one man with the usual overlay of sado-masochistic fantasy. *The Museum's historian doesn't even know where the place was!* It "may have been" near Giessen. "May have been?" That's the best historical writing $200 million can buy?

When I challenge such gas-chamber vaporings I understand I'm going to be slandered as an antisemite by the True Believers in the Holocaust Lobby. These quasi-religious Holocaust zealots claim that because of the purity of their own feelings about the Jewish experience during World War Two, mine must be soiled when I express doubt in what they preach as "truth."

Yet not even Winston Churchill in his six-volume history of World War Two, or Dwight D. Eisenhower in his memoirs, made reference to homicidal gassing chambers. How do the Holocaust Lobby and its Museum explain that?

Journalists who ask why I question the gas chamber stories rather than some other, less "sensitive" issue, should ask themselves why *they* never *dare* question them!

Professors who do not believe that intellectual freedom is worth the while on this historical issue, should ask themselves why they believe it's worth the while on *any* historical issue.

The Operation and Technique of the Museum

The Museum's exhibit technique is a mixture of sinister suggestion and dishonest omission. The first display confronting visitors beginning the Museum tour is a wall-sized photograph of American soldiers looking at corpses smoldering on a pyre. The context in which you see the photo suggests that the dead pictured in it are murdered Jews.

But were the prisoners killed or did they die of typhus or some other disease during the last terrible weeks of the war? Autopsies made by Allied medical personnel found that inmates died of disease. Not one was found to have been "gassed." *All such relevant information is purposely omitted from this exhibit. We don't even know that the dead pictured in the photo are Jews!*

Unable to judge the significance of the photograph, and not wanting to believe the Museum would mislead you, you are moved to accept the false and manipulative suggestion that it somehow represents the "genocide" of the European Jews.

We Don't Have to Argue About It! Here's the Answer!

I'm willing to be convinced I'm wrong about the gas chambers. All it will take is honest proof that they existed. The Holocaust Museum either displays such proof or it doesn't. We don't have to argue about it. CALL THE MUSEUM! Find out for yourself. The telephone number is (202) 488 0400. Ask which Museum exhibit (specifically) displays proof that the gas chambers existed. Have this (or any) newspaper publish the result. Then we'll all see what's what!

Special pleaders imply that to investigate the gas chamber stories in the light of day will be harmful to Jews. What a bigoted insinuation! Free inquiry will *benefit* Jews—for exactly the reasons it benefits us all. Call the Museum. You have nothing to lose but your innocence.

COMMITTEE FOR OPEN DEBATE ON THE HOLOCAUST (CODOH) is not affiliated with any political group or organization. We need your support to shine the light of free inquiry on this historical controversy. For your contribution of $20 I will send you regular updates on our progress. If you contribute $50 or more, you will receive the regular updates plus two book-length excerpts from my work in progress, **Confessions of a Holocaust Revisionist.** Send contributions, relevant press clippings and other communications to:

CODOH: P.O. Box 3267 Visalia CA 93278 Tel/Fax: (209) 733 2653

This advertisement (reduced in size) by Bradley Smith's "Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust" appeared, in one form or another, in at least 35 student papers during the 1993–94 school year. Student editors on these campuses rejected the arguments and pressures of the Anti-Defamation League and other pressure groups, which contend that Americans lack the intelligence and wisdom to make up their own minds about this issue.

York at Albany. Headlined "The ADL's Nazi Devil Fantasy," the essay criticized the Anti-Defamation League for its efforts to suppress open discussion of the Holocaust issue, and particularly to stop publication of Smith's CODOH ads. Although this essay angered the campus Jewish Student Coalition, *Student Press* managing editor Eric Dagnall refused to apologize for running the piece. (Albany *Times Union*, Jan. 31.)

Smith's media outreach efforts also led to a front-page article and editorial about him in the February 17 issue of the *Collegian*, student paper at California State University at Fresno, a letter to the editor in the *Chicago Tribune* of February 27, a mention in the Cleveland *Plain Dealer* of April 9, and in several letters to the editor published in the Detroit *Free Press*, March 16.

Television and Radio Appearances

Smith's "Campus Project" success brought an invitation to appear on the nationally-televised "Donahue Show." (For more on this, see the May-June 1994 *Journal*.) His appearance there led, in turn, to guest appearances by Smith and other CODOH spokesman on several radio talk show programs.

On April 13, Bradley Smith appeared as a guest for an hour on Ft. Meyers, Florida, radio station WINK-AM. Two days later he was interviewed about his campaign for greater public awareness on the Holocaust issue during a 20-minute appearance on ABC Network Radio, which aired over a hundred affiliate stations across the country. On April 18, Smith appeared for one-half hour on WHJJ-AM radio, Providence, Rhode Island.

Friedrich Berg, a member of this *Journal*'s Editorial Advisory Committee, appeared as a CODOH spokesman for an hour on April 16 as a radio talk show guest on WFTL-AM, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida, and, the next day, for half an hour on WBSM-AM of New Bedford, Conn. On April 19 he was a guest for a full hour on WAFJ-AM, which serves the Decatur-Huntsville area of northern Alabama.

Robert Countess

Dr. Robert Countess appeared as a CODOH spokesman on April 11 for an hour as a guest on Chicago radio WVON, a major black-listenership station. His successful presentation, which was hosted by Cliff Kelly, went ahead in spite of demands from some irate Jewish groups in the area that the station cancel the appearance.

Countess, an educator and a member of this *Journal*'s Editorial Advisory Committee, has proven to be an effective and personable spokesmen for historical revisionism. Last year, for example, he appeared as a spokesman for the Institute for Historical Review on New York City television station WPIX's half-hour "11 News Closeup" program.

During his seven-minute appearance, which

ADL official trying to stop debates on Holocaust ads before they start
Holocaust revisionist dilemma
Holocaust ad prompts debate
Holocaust ad stirring up campuses
Questions murder of Jews
Holocaust Denial Update:
Bradley Smith Targets More Colleges, Turns His Sights on High Schools, Too
Revisionists gather steam
Holocaust ad in UM paper costs $2 million donation
PRESS
Debating the Holocaust
Those who deny the Nazi atrocities are finding a platform in college newspapers and raising a First Amendment ruckus
Holocaust revisionism at Queens College
U.S. Catholic, Jewish Leaders Decry Holocaust Revisionists
Holocaust revisionist ad runs
University of Maryland student newspaper to blame
Brandeis Is in Uproar Over Paper's Holocaust Ad

A small sampling of headlines (reduced in size) from the many dozens of newspaper and magazine articles that have appeared during the past year about Smith's campaign to place advertisements in student papers calling for open debate on the Holocaust issue.

was aired on April 24, 1993, Countess calmly pointed out that there are serious problems with the Holocaust extermination story. He spoke about the fraudulent "confession" of Auschwitz commandant Höss, which was obtained by torture. Countess said that the familiar Six Million figure is a gross exaggeration, and he explained the dreadful conditions in the German camps during the final months of the war. The Holocaust, he said, has become a kind of Jewish racket. Following Countess' appearance, host Marvin Scott was shown with three other guests who were encouraged to refute the IHR spokesman, including American Jewish Committee official Kenneth Stern (author of the anti-revisionist book, *Holocaust Denial*).

A Show of His Own

For some years Bradley Smith has appeared as a guest on more than three hundred radio and television talk shows across the nation. Now he has a regularly scheduled radio show of his own. On July 12, Smith's hour-long show began airing weekly on Providence (Rhode Island) station WALE (AM 990). His show, sponsored by CODOH, is broadcast from noon to 1:00 p.m. every Tuesday. Promotional notices and commercials for Smith's show are routinely aired throughout the week. Station WALE — on which Smith had already appeared several times as a talk show guest — has the largest radio listenership in the area (which includes Brown University and the University of Rhode Island).

The ADL Smear Campaign

Smith's success in reaching students and educators through his ad campaign is all the more remarkable because it has been achieved in spite of a well-financed and -coordinated smear campaign by the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) and other Jewish groups.

Unable to take issue with the content of Smith's CODOH ad, the ADL attempts instead to castigate Smith as a person, accusing him of the worst sins that anyone can be accused of in today's America. Typically, the ADL tries to persuade editors that Smith is a "hate monger" with ties to notorious neo-Nazis, who is supposedly promoting a secret neo-Nazi "agenda." In spite of the ad's civil and restrained text, the would-be censors continue to characterize it, inaccurately and unfairly, as "Holocaust denial," "anti-Semitic," "hate propaganda," and worse.

In the February-March 1994 issue of the *ADL On The Frontline* newsletter, the Anti-Defamation League warned:

> Smith has had a long time association with the California-based Institute for Historical Review (IHR), America's leading clearing house for Holocaust denial propaganda. His ad campaign is the centerpiece of the Institute's long-standing effort to influence America's youth.

This statement is not entirely inaccurate. As part of its "Media Project," the IHR is pleased to be able to provide funding for Smith's outreach work.

As part of the well-financed effort to counter Smith's campus outreach effort, student newspaper editors are being given expense-paid two-week summer trips to Poland and Israel, a propaganda tour that includes stops at Auschwitz, Krakow, and the former site of the Warsaw Ghetto. (Philadelphia *Jewish Times*, Feb. 17.)

Jewish groups have succeeded in gaining some non-Jewish support for their anti-revisionist campaign. In March, the Synagogue Council of America and the National Conference of Catholic Bishops issued a "Joint Statement on Dealing with Holocaust Revisionism," which declared: "All educational institutions and their publications, whether official or student sponsored, should unconditionally reject any efforts to deny the horrifying realities of the Holocaust."

Crime and Punishment at The Georgetown Voice

Because they had decided to publish Smith's CODOH ad, three top editors of Georgetown University's *Georgetown Voice* paper were "punished" with a guided tour of the US Holocaust Memorial Council in Washington, DC. This cartoon, distributed by CODOH, comments on the situation.

Heading up the ADL's anti-Smith campaign is Jeffrey Ross, who worked closely with ADL regional offices and Hillel groups around the country to pressure student papers into rejecting the CODOH ad. Ross told the Philadelphia *Jewish Times* (Feb. 17) that

> The Holocaust deniers are the ideological vanguard of the neo-Nazis, the Ku Klux Klan, Skinheads, white supremacists . . . Our point is that there is no debate over the Holocaust. There is not more than one position on the existence of the Holocaust. It happened. Period. End of story . . . Our way of responding to them is not to debate them on their own terms, but rather to expose them for the bigots and neo-Nazis they are.

Ross complained that "the [CODOH] ad in the Brandeis newspaper cost Bradley Smith $130, and he got millions of dollars' worth of publicity." Ross claimed to be "surprised" and "saddened" that

> Jews on the editorial board want to prove that they are such pure journalists and have such a pure commitment to freedom of speech that they will not allow the fact of their being Jewish to stand in the way of what they consider their duty to the journalistic profession . . . Therefore, they're going to decide to publish it.

On another occasion Ross charged (*Martyrdom and Resistance*, New York, Jan.-Feb. 1994):

> The Holocaust-denial campaign is probably the most widespread and effective anti-Semitic campaign since World War II in the United States ... The ADL and our colleagues in the Jewish community are expending all of our resources in responding to it.

Confident that Smith's efforts are no match for its own formidable financial and organizational resources, the Anti-Defamation League boasted in its April-May 1994 *On The Frontline* newsletter that a "lack of success in Bradley Smith's current campaign targeting campus newspapers with paid advertisements denying the reality of the Holocaust is testimony to the counteraction efforts of ADL." While noting that Smith's ad had appeared in 14 campus publications in the fall 1993 semester, the ADL newsletter asserted that his "current campaign has been much less successful." Such bragging proved premature. In fact, Smith's ad campaign overall during the 1993-1994 school year was by far the most successful ever.

"Jewish Onslaught Against Freedom"

In their effort to keep Smith's ad from appearing, Jewish groups such as the ADL, and Jewish intellectuals such as Emory University professor Deborah Lipstadt (author of the anti-revisionist polemic *Denying the Holocaust*), insult American students and educators. In effect, groups such as the ADL arrogantly insist that American students and teachers lack the intelligence and wisdom to make up their own minds about this issue.

The ADL argument that Smith's ad should not be permitted to appear because it "offends" some Jews is likewise specious and arrogant. Nearly everyone finds at least some advertising "offensive." And if Holocaust revisionism were really as absurd

as the ADL contends, no one need fear that will ever gain any significant acceptance among scholars or the general public.

In an essay published as a guest editorial in the SUNY-Stony Brook *Statesman*, June 6, Smith castigated the concerted efforts by the groups such as the ADL and Hillel to censor his ads. "What this amounts to," he aptly pointed out, "is nothing less than a Jewish onslaught against intellectual freedom." Smith went on to write:

> . . . On every campus in America where there is a substantial number of Jewish students, the Hillel organization (campus arm of the ADL, usually led by a rabbi) leads the attack against free inquiry and open debate on the Holocaust controversy. I am astounded that Jewish intellectuals and scholars stand idly by while the reputation of Jews as free thinkers is everywhere corrupted, diminished and burlesqued by a handful of organized Jewish extremists and censors.
>
> Student editors who are Jewish are under special pressure from the Holocaust lobby to betray their ideals as journalists and to betray as well the long tradition of intellectual liberty for which Jews have worked all over the world. Jewish editors are attacked ferociously, not only by spokespersons for organized Jewry off campus, but also on campus by well-meaning but unsophisticated students egged on by Hillel rabbis who function as semi-professional censors.
>
> Student editors who are not Jewish, while they experience all the above, must face the additional burden of being slandered as "anti-semites" and "haters." I understand why many are unwilling or even afraid to shoulder the burden that the ideal of a free press places on journalists with regard to the Holocaust controversy.

Impact

More than any other single person, Smith is succeeding in making skeptical discussion of the Holocaust story an established part of America's social-cultural landscape. While it is difficult to measure, it appears that his CODOH campaign is having a real impact on how students look at European history and American society. Professor Lipstadt now laments that, as a result of the efforts of Smith and other revisionists, "good students come in and ask, 'How do we know there were gas chambers?'." (*U.S. News & World Report*, Feb. 28.)

Smith's ad campaign, and the furor and publicity it has generated, have done much to raise public awareness about a particular chapter of European history and the issue of free speech. At least as important, the Smith ad campaign is teaching valuable lessons about American social-cultural and political life.

Even for those who may believe that the revisionists are entirely wrong about the historical issues involved here, the frantic and highly emotional nature of the effort to suppress a soberly worded advertisement questioning an aspect of the Holocaust story provides important lessons about political, social and cultural realities in today's America. For one thing, it teaches that we are expected to show greater sensitivity toward Jewish concerns and interests than to those of any other group, and it points up the almost religious role that the Holocaust story has come to play in American society.

Courage and Devotion

The success of Bradley Smith's ad campaign is a major defeat for the organized forces of bigotry, and a significant victory for the cause of freedom of speech and greater public awareness of history.

None of the student editors who made the decision to run Smith's ad have expressed public support for his skeptical view of the Holocaust gas chamber story. Indeed, some expressed animosity toward him for daring to raise the issue. And yet, these editors, some of them Jewish, choose to defy the threats and pleadings of the ADL and Hillel by providing Smith with a forum for his supposedly outrageous views. In doing so, these young men and women have shown greater courage and devotion to the principle of intellectual freedom and a free press than editors of many major metropolitan dailies and television network producers.

This editorial cartoon commenting on Smith's ad campaign appeared April 12 in *The Miami Hurricane*, student paper at the University of Miami (Florida). Betraying the arrogant ignorance that is all too common of those who learn their history from television and movies, the cartoonist seems to believe that the existence of crematory ovens in German wartime camps is proof of an extermination program.

How Zionist Leaders Doctored Historical Documents About Plans for Mass "Ethnic Cleansing" of Palestinian Arabs

In spite of the unusually close tie between the United States and Israel — a bond that several US Presidents have called a "special relationship" — Americans are remarkably ignorant about the true history of the Zionist takeover of Palestine, the machinations behind the foundation of the Jewish state in 1948, and the covert side of relations between their own country and Israel. So pervasive is American fear of offending Jewish sensibilities that it is not surprising that Israel's Hebrew-language press is frequently more ready than the American press to shed light on the embarrassing side of Zionist history.

In the following essay, which is excerpted from the Israeli Hebrew-language daily paper Haaretz, *February 4, 1994, writer Benny Morris explains how Zionist leaders doctored the official record of speeches at the 20th Zionist Congress of 1937, notably those in which Zionist leaders spoke in favor of plans to expel or relocate ("transfer") as many as 300,000 Palestinian Arabs from their homes as part of a plan to impose Jewish rule in Palestine. As this essay explains, Zionist leaders "rewrote history" for self-serving propagandistic purposes, and in such a way as to deceive even supposedly careful historians. (This translation is from the May 1994 issue of* From the Hebrew Press, *which is prepared by Dr. Israel Shahak and published by Middle East Data Center, P.O. Box 337, Woodbridge, VA 22194.)*

There are nations and political movements which, in seeking to create an unblemished image, rewrite not only their own history but also the documents on which that historiography is based. The Zionist movement is perhaps one of the most skillful practitioners of this strange art. In its case, the rewriting concerns the most sensitive area of Zionist history — the conflict with the Arabs, and especially the events and policies in which the Zionist side thought or acted in a manner that could be considered to be immoral.

In the course of the past decade the secrecy has been lifted from most documents of the [Israeli] state and its political parties. Now historians are able to re-examine the historic Zionist documents and protocols. A large part of what has been opened up now appears to be deficient and faulty, if not patently false.

The year 1937 was important in the development of the Zionist movement and the Zionist-Arab conflict. In 1936 the Arab Revolt broke out. The purpose of the revolt was to halt the turning of Palestine into a Jewish homeland and, more specifically, to stop the massive Jewish immigration and the purchasing of Arab land by Jews. They feared that the Jews would quickly become a majority and that the establishment of a Jewish state was just a step away.

At the end of that year, during a lull in the revolt (which the British totally repressed only in 1939), the British government sent an inquiry commission to Palestine, headed by Lord William Robert Peel, to investigate the reasons for the Revolt and to make recommendations. On July 7, 1937, the commission duly published its recommendations: to divide Palestine into three parts — a Jewish state, an Arab state, and a British enclave consisting of Jerusalem with its surrounding area and a corridor to the Mediterranean at Jaffa.

In order to guarantee the homogeneity of the proposed Jewish state and to prevent irredentism, there was a crucially important recommendation by the Peel Commission: to conduct a transfer of 225,000 of the Arab minority (which numbered 300,000) that were living in areas allotted to the Jewish state. They were supposed to be transferred to the new Arab state or to neighboring Arab countries, hopefully, willingly and with proper compensation, but if not — then by force. The report chastely termed the transfer "a population exchange." The exchange was to involve 225,000 Arabs, as well as 1,250 Jews who were then living in areas allocated for the Arab state. The transfer plan was shelved by a subsequent inquiry commission (the Woodhead Commission) and by the British government itself in 1938.

The idea of partition gave rise to a major dispute within the Jewish community. While the recommendation for transfer was almost universally accepted by the Jews, many doubted whether the British would indeed implement it. Nevertheless, [Zionist leader] David Ben-Gurion, who headed the struggle for the acceptance of the Peel plan, was extremely conscious of the sensitivity regarding the

transfer plan and the dynamite inherent in it. Some minority populations in parts of Europe and in Turkey and Greece had indeed been forcefully transferred not so long ago [in 1923-24, a million Greeks and 400,000 Turks were forcibly exchanged, under League of Nations auspices], but the concept remained a morally questionable step.

Although Ben-Gurion [who later served as Israel's first Prime Minister] and Chaim Weizmann [who later was Israel's first President] and other Zionist leaders wished for transfer, they usually expressed their opinion on this matter only in closed Zionist forums. They sometimes spoke in more public forums, but tried to censor the publication of their speeches afterwards. The result was not only a rewriting of Zionist history but also rewriting of Zionist documentation . . .

Rewriting the documents of the 20th Zionist Congress, which met in Zurich [Switzerland], August 3–21, 1937, was certainly a collective effort. It was the Zionist movement and not [merely] individuals that attempted to polish up the protocols of the speeches made for the use of future generations. The delegates spoke German, Yiddish, English and Hebrew. Stenographers recorded what was said in the course of the consecutive Zionist Congress meetings. Translators used the stenographers' notebooks and supplied transcripts in Hebrew and German. The original notebooks no longer exist, but many of the speeches and debates exist as Hebrew photocopies. Two or three days after they were made, the speeches supposedly were printed verbatim in the Congress "Newspaper." This periodical was published in Zurich every day or two in the course of the Zionist Congress, and was edited by Moshe Kleinman. For his publications Kleinman apparently referred to the Hebrew transcripts. But many of the speeches had undergone political editing and censorship between the time they were made and publication. One may notice this immediately when comparing the original Hebrew texts of the speeches and as they appeared in the Congress "Newspaper." The editing was done by each speaker himself or by [Zionist] movement leaders, or by Kleinman, acting on orders from his political superiors.

In the course of the following months, Leo (Aryeh) Lauterbach, head of the Zionist movement's organization department, prepared the speeches for publication in book form. Lauterbach, assisted by Moshe Gordon, a Jewish Agency official, explained in his hand-written autobiography (written in English and never published) that his goal was "to guarantee the original integrity." From the version that was published in February-March 1938 in Hebrew (and in German) [was produced] *The 20th Zionist Congress and the 5th Session of the Jewish Agency Council, Zurich, August 3–21, 1937, A Stenographic Report* (published by the management of the Zionist Movement and the Jewish Agency, Jerusalem). It is obvious that instead of referring to the stenographers' notebooks or the Hebrew typed texts, Lauterbach simply chose from what appeared in the "Newspaper," corrected typing and grammatical mistakes, and published it.

The articles appearing in the Congress "Newspaper" and in the Congress *Stenographic Report* are identical. As the title indicates, the *Stenographic Report* professed to be a verbatim record of the statements voiced at the Zionist Congress. In fact, the speeches as they appeared in this *Stenographic Report* are, in many cases, significantly different from the original typed text.

The major differences focus on the Zionist movement's attitude towards the Arabs and its policy towards them, mainly concerning the question of transfer. Up to now the Congress *Stenographic Report* has been the major or exclusive source used by historians for the statements made at the Zionist Congress. (For example it is used by [historian] Shabtai Teveth, for whom it serves as the [only] source. Teveth either could not locate the original transcripts or preferred to use the official and censored Zionist versions.) But in the Congress *Stenographic Report*, portions of the original speeches were totally deleted in order to significantly alter the meaning of the speeches. Usually, the omitted sentences and entire paragraphs concerned the issue of transfer.

The most important alterations are found in speeches and declarations of the movement's leaders. Weizmann clearly expressed sympathy and support for the transfer recommendation of the Peel Commission in his speeches, above all in his "political speech" on August 4. Unfortunately, neither the stenographic version nor the typed text of the speech survived, but there are repeated references to Weizmann's statements concerning transfer in the speeches of others, as they appear in the original typed texts as well as in the Congress *Stenographic Report* and in the Congress "Newspaper." For example, Dr. Moshe Glikson, one of the founders of the Zionist Democratic Party, said in his speech on August 9:

> There is a heavy cloud over the issue of the transfer. We should not be surprised to find some among us enthusiastic about it. They believe that it is possible to remove hundreds of thousands of Arabs from the Jewish state, just like that, in one sweep. Dr. Weizmann, who was more cautious than many of the supporters of this proposal, said that it would be possible to transfer 100,000 Arabs to the Arab state within 20 years.

Glikson argued that "5,000 per year" would not solve the demographic problem, in light of the much higher birthrate among the Arabs. "Of course," Glikson went on, "there are those who believe in the possibility of a complete transfer in the course of a short period . . ." Glikson named Shmuel Zokhow-

itzky, a leader from the agricultural settlements, as one who had "even asked Dr. Weizmann not to show any mercy" in this matter. Glikson explained:

> Dr. Weizmann told us about the plan to establish a fund for a large scale resettlement of Arabs. Jews would contribute three million pounds to it . . . I think there is reason to fear . . . we will not be able to find so many Arab peasants willing to leave the area of the Jewish state. We will not be able to remove them from the Jewish state by force, and no resettlement plan will encourage them to leave the Jewish state and go to the poorer eastern Jordan.

The editors of the Congress *Stenographic Report* left most of the text intact, although they deleted the sentence regarding Zokhowitzky's request that Weizmann address the question of the transfer unmercifully.

Other speakers at the assembly also associated themselves with Weizmann's statement about the transfer. Ussishkin said on August 10:

> When I heard the statement of the head of our movement . . . Dr. Weizmann, about his support for transfer of 300,000 Arabs out of the Jewish state . . . I said to myself: "My God, how far has this psychosis spread even among the greatest people!". . . Will a Mohammed suddenly leave our state? Why? . . . Is there any hope that the Arabs living in our country will of their own volition agree to grant us those millions of *dunums* [of land]?

But the most blatant distortion of the original was achieved by the editors of the Congress "Newspaper" and the *Stenographic Report* in omitting from Ben-Gurion's speech on August 7 all reference to the transfer problem. According to the original typed texts of the speech, Ben-Gurion declared:

> We must thoroughly examine the question whether the transfer is possible, necessary, moral and useful. We do not wish to dispossess anybody. Population transfers have been carried out previously in Palestine in various places. Now the transfer will have to be done on an entirely different scale. In many areas there will be no possibility for new Jewish settlement being established except by transferring the Arabs out of these areas. The British commission addressed this question seriously and it is important that transfer should appear as coming from the commission and not from us . . . Population transfer allows us to draw a comprehensive settlement plan. To our joy, Arabs have huge and desolate lands. The growing Jewish strength in Palestine will increase our possibilities of conducting a large scale transfer. You must remember that this method also contains an important Zionist and humanist idea — to transfer parts of the people to their own land.

This clear statement was entirely omitted from the Zionist Congress assembly's official printed [record of] speeches. Indeed, both speeches — the original and the rewritten version that appeared in the "Newspaper" and in the *Stenographic Report* — are fundamentally different as far as they concern the Arab problem. It may only be concluded that immediately following what he said in his speech, Ben-Gurion had second thoughts, and gave a rewritten version to the editors of the Congress "Newspaper."

In the published version, both in the "Newspaper" and in the Congress *Stenographic Report*, Ben-Gurion made an effort to expand this paragraph, and this is [accordingly] how it appeared:

> We are asked, how will we manage with the Arab minority, a minority of 300,000 Arabs among 400,000 Jews . . . The Jewish people . . . cannot forget the lesson of 2,000 years of Diaspora [dispersion] and the fate of its sons in foreign lands . . . [In the anticipated Jewish state] there will be one law both for the foreigner and the citizen. A just regime, brotherly love, true equality. The Jewish state will be a shining example for the world in treating minorities and foreigners . . . An Arab policeman supporting rioters from among his people will be punished with all the rigor of the law, just as a Jewish policeman will be punished if he does not protect an Arab from a Jewish hooligan if, Heaven forbid, a Jewish hooligan will appear in our midst.

But because he supported transfer of the Arabs, this paragraph must be regarded as being lip service.

These hitherto unpublished documents add to our understanding of the attitude of the Zionist leaders toward the idea of transfer prior to the establishment of Israel. But there is a broader lesson to be learned by historians from them, and not only with regard to the 1937 documents. The speeches, debates, diaries and memoranda that the Zionist bureaucrats issued wholesale passed through the sieve of political censorship on the way to publication; a large portion disappeared or was distorted. What happened to the 1937 documents also happened to Zionist documents from other years. Historians and students using those sources would do well to employ a large measure of caution in their use.

Correction:

In the May–June 1994 issue, page 37, two paragraphs are erroneously repeated. The paragraphs in the first column beginning with the words "No new work of art . . .," and "Every age and every form . . ." should be disregarded.

A French Scholar Responds to a Widely Acclaimed Anti-Revisionist Work about Auschwitz

On Pressac: History by Night or in Fog?

SERGE THION

Considerable attention has been devoted during the past year to a book on "The Crematories of Auschwitz" by French pharmacist Jean-Claude Pressac. Published in September 1993, it has been widely praised for providing definitive proof that the "Holocaust deniers" are wrong. For example, The New Yorker *(Nov. 15, p. 73) commented that Pressac has provided "incontrovertible evidence" of the existence of a wartime German "industrial-style process" for killing Jews. Similarly,* Newsweek *magazine (Dec. 20) praised the new Pressac book as a "dramatic rebuttal" of revisionist views. "Holocaust experts have hailed his work as definitive," the influential weekly added. (A brief, preliminary critique of Pressac's new book appeared in the January-February 1994* Journal.*)*

Serge Thion, born in 1942, has devoted some 30 years to study, analysis and writing on social, economic and political issues, particularly in agrarian societies.

His research has taken him to many countries in the Middle East, northern, eastern and southern Africa, Southeast Asia, and the South Pacific. After seven years of studies in sociology, anthropology, history and linguistics at the Paris Sorbonne, he received a doctorate in sociology from that school in 1967. His doctoral dissertation on the South African political system was published in 1969 under the title *Le pouvoir pâle, ou le racisme sud-africain*. Between 1967 and 1970 he taught in Vietnam and Cambodia.

From 1971 until 1993 he was a research fellow with the National Center for Scientific Research (CNRS) in Paris, with special emphasis on the history of land problems and land reform in Vietnam and Cambodia, as well as political history and war and revolution in Rhodesia and Mozambique, and the history of statecraft in Southeast Asia.

Dr. Thion is the author of numerous scholarly articles, half of them dealing with Southeast Asia, which have appeared in academic periodicals in the USA, France, Germany and other countries. He is also the author of several books, including *Vérité historique ou vérité politique?* (in collaboration with Robert Faurisson), *Une Allumette sur la banquise: Ecrits de combat,* and (in English, 1993) *Watching Cambodia* (White Lotus, G.P.O. Box 1141, Bangkok 1141, Thailand).

This review essay is translated by the author and Theodore J. O'Keefe, and edited by Mark Weber. It appears, with the author's cooperation, for the first time here in English.

While a German edition of Pressac's book has been issued, an English-language edition apparently is not forthcoming. Instead, an abridged portion of it is included in Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp, *a 528-page work recently published in association with the taxpayer-funded United States Holocaust Memorial Museum.*

Pressac's writings — including his much-discussed 1989 book — and the considerable discussion they have generated, confirm that a genuine debate about the supposed extermination gas chambers is underway. In the following review essay, French scholar Serge Thion contributes to the welcome discussion with a detailed and highly critical look at Pressac's new book. Incidentally, Thion's title for this essay is a play on the title of a 1955 French Holocaust movie, "Night and Fog," that is obligatorily shown in school classrooms throughout France.

"Historian by night," writes the Paris daily newspaper *Le Monde* in its presentation of the new work of an "amateur" who happens to be a pharmacist by day.[1] While for the last twelve years revisionists have been reproached as being merely "amateurish historians," suddenly this term is presented as a quality that guarantees the worth of the new thesis being promoted by the media as the definitive response to the revisionists. I shall not be so cruel as to recall that this one joins a long list of "definitive responses" that have figured on various lists, since the big trials of 1980–1982, and including masterworks such as Filip Müller's *Eyewitness Auschwitz: Three Years in the Gas Chambers*, or Claude Lanzmann's cinematographic production, "Shoah."[2]

Jean-Claude Pressac, the author of this miraculous new book, *Les crématoires d'Auschwitz* ("The Crematories of Auschwitz"),[3] has already been presented several times as the ultimate champion, the man who will finally terminate Professor Robert Faurisson. He showed up during a colloquium at the Sorbonne in 1982 that was supposed to have already settled the question. His patron at that time was the Great Moral Conscience of our age, Pierre Vidal-Naquet, the White Knight in the struggle against revisionism. Because the discussion dealt mainly with material and technical questions,

which were way beyond Vidal-Naquet's competence as a specialist of Greek history, he had palmed Pressac off onto another archenemy of revisionism, Georges Wellers, a little-known chemist who happened also to be the editor of the journal of the Jewish documentation center in Paris.

After a long period of hesitation, Wellers published a paper by Pressac in his holy and irreproachable journal, *Le Monde Juif* (July-September 1982). In that paper Pressac developed his theory of "little gassings," abandoning altogether the canonical version that had ruled until then. He replaced it with the view that, of course, gassings had taken place, but on a smaller scale than previously thought, and that all figures must now be revised downwards. The impact of Pressac's new theory was negligible. Other means were needed to make use of Pressac in the struggle against revisionism. The Klarsfeld clan, with its strong community and media ties, was ready to intervene.

Jean-Claude Pressac

With their help, Pressac produced an enormous hodgepodge. In his research in the Auschwitz archives, he was not able to find any definitive proof that the Nazis had set up a murder factory there. Instead, he found a number of circumstantial traces that he thought might lead to some kind of presumption of extermination. It was couched in language reminiscent of a weak court case.

His 1989 book, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operations of the Gas Chambers*, included hundreds of plans, blueprints, photographs and documents from the Auschwitz camp's technical departments, which were, of course, part of the SS administration. In an effort to make this massive and disorganized dossier more convincing, the Klarsfeld organized its non-dissemination. Reports of its existence were considered more effective than its actual distribution in bookstores. Translated into English (no French-language edition was ever made available), and published in New York, it was not publicly sold, and was sent to few of those who ordered it. It was given merely to "responsible community leaders" and "opinion makers." Through its impalpable existence, it was supposed to promote the idea that there now existed, finally, The Response to revisionism.

Revisionists quickly managed to get hold of copies of this work, which neither Vidal-Naquet nor Klarsfeld obviously had ever read closely. Otherwise they would have caught a certain number of oddities and inconsistencies that would have caused them to doubt if they'd picked the right horse.

Pressac was trotted out again to battle against Fred Leuchter, the American expert of gas chamber construction who had carried out on-site examinations of, and took wall scrapings from, the supposed gas chambers, and who concluded that massive and repeated gassings would have been physically impossible.

Now we are presented for the fourth time with what the press calls the definitive argument. This time Pressac has another patron, an official historian by the name of François Bédarida who has been for quite some time head of the so-called "Institute of the Modern Age." He once distinguished himself by taking part, along with some shadowy political figures, in a phony academic "jury" that decreed, without reading it, that Henri Roques' thesis on the "confessions" of Kurt Gerstein was completely worthless. Having thus styled himself a master, Bédarida, whose works on English history are deservedly almost unknown, also wrote a thin booklet, in the form of a catechism, about the so-called Holocaust. It has been distributed free of cost to every history teacher in France in order to provide them with guidelines on how to stuff their pupils' heads with sanitized notions about Second World War events. Emboldened by such mass distribution, Bédarida felt brave enough to write an article in *Le Monde* (July 22–23, 1990) in which he revised the Auschwitz death toll downwards. It did not occur to him to explain why this revision was necessary, or the basis for his view that not four million, but rather 1.1 million people supposedly died in Auschwitz. Obviously still not entirely confident of himself, he added that the archives have still not been explored. He would not elaborate to explain why 45 years have not been enough time. Here's where Pressac came in.

Along with a few minor satellites, this luminary of historical thought, Bédarida, now serves as Pressac's patron. This patronage is not negligible, because Pressac's new book is published by the National Center for Scientific Research (CNRS). In order to obtain this prestigious label, the book was submitted to an ad hoc committee of specialists. There must have also been an official evaluation of some kind, which we would be delighted to read.

What does Pressac's book really say? It presents incontrovertible evidence that the Germans built crematories. Of course, only journalists believe, or pretend to believe, that the revisionists deny the existence of the crematories or of the concentration camps. These concentration camp crematories are well-known and have been documented since 1945. The issue has been whether they disguised secret facilities for carrying out mass killing.

Pressac, who combed through tens of thousands of documents left behind by the Auschwitz *Baulei-*

tung (construction office), states categorically that these installations, as planned from the outset, show no sign of lethal or homicidal intent whatsoever, and that they were specifically designed and built to contend with the health problems caused by a rather high mortality rate in the camps, above all after the beginning of the war. These problems, he shows, were linked with the raging epidemics that could (and did) wreak havoc not only among the camp inmates, but also among the Germans in the camps as well as the outside population. In this context, crematories had no ethical import, but were conceived as facilities to maintain public health, of the inmates as well as others.

Having carried out a detailed study of the correspondence between the Auschwitz construction office and the outside private civilian firms that contracted for specific jobs, Pressac is able to provide us with a thorough — and quite tedious — history of the different phases in the construction of the various crematories, including the numerous changes in plans by the chiefs of the SS construction office. Evidently lacking anything like a long-term perspective, these officials depended closely on their superiors, who envisioned grand projects without bothering much about the budgetary and procurement problems that those poor subordinates would have to solve on the spot.

Among these thousands of documents, where there are no secrets, where the SS "politicians" scarcely interfere; documents which after the war were divided among Germany, Poland, and Moscow; documents that remained intact at the end of the war, the department head having "neglected" to destroy them: among all these documents, there is not a single one that states clearly that these facilities were ever used for mass killing. Not one.

Pressac offers no explanation whatever of this strange fact. To be sure, following others, he states that the references found in certain documents to "special actions" refer in coded form to the existence of that monstrous crime. But the documents oblige him also to state "special actions" could and did designate all sorts of "other," quite banal activities, and that the term "special" (in German, "*Sonder-*") was very widely used in the German military and nonmilitary administration during that period.

The great value of Pressac's work would therefore lie in its almost complete sifting through of the documents dealing with the construction of the crematories, the presumed site and instrument of the alleged crime. As in his previous writings, he picks out "traces" of criminal intent. Many of these, incidentally, he's had to leave by the wayside. A number of "traces" he presented in his 1989 book are conspicuously missing from the 1993 work.

He notes, for example, that the SS wanted to install ventilation systems in the underground morgues of the crematories. He considers that this shows an intent to use these rooms for criminal purposes. Pressac is so convinced of this that he doesn't even bother to consider alternative explanations that would occur to less prejudiced souls, such as, for example, the need to disinfest, during typhus epidemics, the morgues with Zyklon B (used throughout the camp for disinfesting clothes, barracks, and so forth).

He thinks he's found a criminal "trace" in the fact that a wooden fan was requested in the ventilating system, because wood is more resistant to corrosion by hydrocyanic acid than metal. Yet, several days later, the engineer in charge had the wooden fan replaced by a metal one!

Pressac also states that the "definitive proof" of the existence of a homicidal gas chamber in crematory facility (Krema) II is found in a document dated March 1943 (cited on p. 72, doc. 28), which shows that the Auschwitz services were looking for gas detectors capable of detecting traces of prussic acid (hydrocyanic acid). But because he has explained earlier that these services used "tons" of Zyklon B for disinfestation, this "proof" is not particularly probative.

Eighty thousand documents. That's the number Pressac cites in his interview with the *Nouvel Observateur*.[4] These 80,000 documents, which he says he consulted in a matter of some days in Moscow, concern exclusively, if I'm not mistaken, the SS construction office at Auschwitz. One office among many others, therefore, but the one that would have been responsible for designing and constructing the infamous "industrial slaughterhouses." One might be astonished to learn that such installations are entrusted to the same low-level functionaries who dealt with the barracks, the bakeries, the roadworks, and so forth. No secret, no particular precautions were taken, as these same low-level officials didn't hesitate to subcontract with private firms, from which no particular discretion was requested. This is explained, as Pressac abundantly demonstrates, by the fact that these facilities were not designed or planned for a lethal purpose, but, quite to the contrary, as means of local public health control.

It's very clear: of these 80,000 documents, only a fraction of which concern the crematories, *not a single one deals explicitly with an installation for killing*. Otherwise, this document would have long since been brandished triumphantly to the public. Until Pressac, one could surmise that there were hidden or inaccessible archives, harboring such a document. But Pressac tells us that these archives (concerning the Auschwitz construction office) are now complete, and that the chief of this office, evidently believing they contained nothing incriminating, took no measure to destroy them at the end of the war.

In short, it must be acknowledged that among this mass of documents, which are supposed to clarify this issue, there are only a few that raise any

suspicion. Where logically we should have found 1,000 or 10,000 incriminating documents — considering, as Pressac concedes, there was no code language, that no documents were destroyed, and that everything was done according to superior orders — one finds only a few minor elements, the interpretation of which remains open.

These "traces" might conceivably support the charge if we could reconstruct a context in which only one interpretation is possible. Or, if several interpretations were possible, a historian should discuss the various ones before choosing his answer. This is not Pressac's practice. He dares not entertain the possibility of alternative interpretations of the documents. For if he were to give up calling these "the beginnings of proofs" (indeed, in a recent France-Inter radio interview he protested only feebly when a hasty journalist treated his "beginnings of proofs" as well-established proofs), Pressac would have to concede that all his work had been in vain. He would have to concede that he had rigorously demonstrated that German officials and engineers conceived and planned, in a rather disorderly way, crematory facilities that, as a matter of fact, did not work very well. No. This no one has ever doubted. He would have to admit that he had spent ten years of his life pushing on an open door, a door whose plan, conception, and stages of construction he describes in meticulous detail. What is truly interesting here is precisely that he found nothing obvious, in spite of exhaustive research.

What does Pressac do to salvage what he can of the extermination thesis? Injections. The basic text of his book, that is, the product of his own research, is a careful chronicle of the planning and construction of the crematories. He refers here to the archives. The reference notes provide sources: they follow each other with abbreviations to archives (abbreviated as ACM, ARO, AEK, and so forth), according to the key given on page VIII. However, if one turns to check the reference notes that are grouped together on pages 97–109 — and disregarding the rare bibliographic references or the occasional bits of factual information ("Pohl was *Oberzahlmeister* [chief paymaster]") — one finds that the series of archival references is interrupted here by *non-archival* references, either to the official Polish *Kalendarium* (or *Auschwitz Chronicle* — more about this later) or to the supposed postwar "memoirs" of Auschwitz commandant Höss. These non-archival references, we find, are the sources cited by Pressac for the passages in the main text dealing with homicidal gassings.

For example, on page 34 he abandons the archives to write about a "first gassing," and, in the same paragraph, he writes of the cremation "in one or two weeks of intensive work" of 550 to 850 corpses, leading to the deterioration of an oven. There exists no obvious or necessary link between the first "fact," based on the *Kalendarium*[5] and Höss, and the second — an oven's deterioration — the factuality of which is established from archival documents. This link is a merely a supposition that is dishonestly presented here as a fact.

This rigorous scholar then tells us that "it is estimated today that very few homicidal gassings took place in this crematorium, but they have been exaggerated because they impressed direct or indirect witnesses." We know that Pressac is a poor writer, but just what is an "indirect witness"? And what does it mean to "exaggerate" a gassing? We need to decode here, I think. What Pressac means to say in this tortured sentence, I suppose, is more or less this: sure, there has been a lot of talk about gassings in crematory building (Krema) I, in the Auschwitz I (main) camp. Genocidal gassings are supposed to have begun there. However, because the revisionists have pointed out so many inconsistencies, Pressac ("it is estimated") has chosen to give ground ("they have been exaggerated"), attempting to explain inconsistencies by claiming that witnesses were "impressed," even if they were not actually present, but who nonetheless are regarded as "indirect" witnesses. Not a single source, not a single document is cited by Pressac to justify this climb-down.

Pressac knows full well that the "classical" view cannot be defended, but in order to salvage something of it he must make concessions, without being able to justify them either. "It is estimated today . . .," and presto! — the trick is done. What follows is of the same nature. He writes (p. 35):

> As gassing forced the total isolation of the area of the crematorium [not a single witness has ever made such a statement, but this point is a result of revisionist criticism], and since it was impossible to carry them [gassings] out while construction was in progress [same comment], it will be decided at the end of April to transfer this sort of activity to Birkenau [Auschwitz II camp].

There is a pure invention, a supposition asserted as a fact by Pressac so that he can land on his feet and rejoin Establishment history.

The amusing paradox in all this is that Pressac respects the Establishment history only with regard to gassings. As for the rest, he joyously tramples dogmas underfoot. The famous "Wannsee Conference" of January 20, 1942, which so many thoroughly dedicated historians have designated as the time and place of the decision to exterminate, is swept aside in a mere six lines (p. 35). Pressac does what revisionists do: he reads the text of the Wannsee conference protocol, which speaks of the evacuation of the Jews to the East, and says nothing of industrial-scale liquidation. He confirms not a single specific instruction was sent to the Auschwitz construction office as a result of this high-level conference. The fog surrounding the supposed genocide

decision becomes thicker and thicker.

On page 39 we come to the two little farmhouses near Birkenau that are supposed to have been the next sites of gassing extermination. In the middle of the information culled from the archives, one finds a new injection from the *Kalendarium*. On page 41 Pressac reports that Himmler informed Höss "of the choice of his camp as the center for the massive annihilation of the Jews." As Pressac himself tells us, Höss' account contains enormous implausibilities and cannot be trusted at all (footnote 132). It's a rotten branch, but it's the only one left for Pressac to cling to, because he's done no research whatsoever in the realm of policy. That's a job for historians, and thus one far beyond the abilities of our pharmacist. At the same time, though, there is a need to suppose that someone, at some time, made the decision to initiate this vast homicidal enterprise, which was then carried out by low-level functionaries. Himmler might have made the decision, but because Pressac can't find anything to support that supposition, he relies on Höss' admittedly dubious account. Better something than nothing.

When Pressac comments on the work of the inmates' *Sonderkommando* teams "dragging the bodies from the gas chambers" (p. 43), the source he cites (note 141) is once again the *Kalendarium*. Third injection.

Later, on page 47, Pressac tells us that large quantities of Zyklon B were deemed necessary to combat the typhus epidemic that raged in the camp, and that they had been requested from higher authorities on account of a "special action" — which obviously was to disinfest buildings. (One SS man was even poisoned, as the previous page confirms.) Further on this same page, Pressac adds that *Bauleitung* officials gave consideration to building a new crematorium "because of the situation created by the 'special actions'" — an obvious reference to the measures taken in an effort to halt the epidemics. How Pressac manages to conclude from this information that Auschwitz had been chosen "as the site of [the] massive annihilation of the Jews" remains a profound intellectual mystery.

Here was an administration that struggled to contain an epidemic that may have killed 20,000 people (according to Pressac),[6] which had learned from higher authorities that the camp would again be considerably expanded (to accommodate tens of thousands of new deportees from the East, who were considered particularly "lousy"), and which was trying to gather the weapons to combat typhus: tons of Zyklon B and crematories. (Recall that at the Bergen-Belsen camp the British were unable to contain the epidemic that was raging there when they arrived. Some of the most "incriminating" photographs of horrific scenes from the camps were taken at Bergen-Belsen when it was under British administration.)

Pressac then launches his own personal theory (p. 47), which only makes sense if he is attempting to conform to an already established explanation pattern:

> This stupefying cremation facility [nevertheless obviously in strict accord with the needs dictated by the situation there] could not but attract the attention of the SS officials in Berlin [obviously, since they authorized the expenditures] who afterward associated it with the "final solution" of the Jewish problem.

This assertion has no basis in the documents found in the archives.

Ever eager to protect his rear, Pressac believes that these "special actions" (a term that covered anything and everything in the military-administrative jargon of the period) were used as a pretext to obtain authorization from Berlin to construct crematory facility (Krema) III, which he determines actually had a "public health function." In using this "special action" term, then, the sneaky SS men of Auschwitz sought to make Berlin believe that their crematory requirements were linked to the extermination of the Jews, whereas in reality they concerned only the real, normal needs of the camp. This is a good example of Pressac's acrobatic abilities.

I shall not dwell on the issue of open pit incinerations, which provide Pressac with an opportunity (p. 58) to severely criticize Höss' account, except to point out that he invents a figure of 50,000 corpses, burned in two months, based on a calculation of alleged killings that is derived, without actually quoting it, from the *Kalendarium*. Pressac pays no attention to the 100,000 cubic meters of wood (at a minimum) that would have been required, and of which there seems to be no trace in the archives.

Pressac has himself confessed that he first got involved with Auschwitz because he wanted to write a novel, several scenes of which would be set there. We know that many people have had a similar itch. This compelling urge re-emerges from time to time, for instance on page 65, when he simply conjures up, out of the blue, relations between the director and the engineers of the Topf company (which built the ovens for the crematories). The three following pages — in which Pressac, the suburban pharmacist, impersonates the terrible SS as they look for ways to rationally organize gassings — are probably also taken from a novel we'll never read. The welcome details are not derived from the archives, but rather from a testimony dear to Pressac, that of a person named Tauber (footnote 203).

When he evokes the first alleged gassing in crematory facility (Krema) II — supposedly the real industrial killing plant — and which was probably finished in March 1943, Pressac does not cite archival sources, but rather the secondary source *Kalendarium* and Tauber's testimony (pp. 73–74). The second alleged gassing is also based on the *Kalendarium*.

There is no point in going on. Pressac's injection technique is now quite clear. The reader must keep his eye riveted to the footnotes in order to detect the changes in the story line. All this would be quite acceptable if the sources used were of comparable value. But for some time now historians have learned to refer to Danuta Czech's official *Kalendarium* only with the utmost caution. Of this work, Pressac himself writes (note 107, p. 101):

> Danuta Czech has produced a work that is vulnerable to criticism because, without explanation, it retains some testimonies while dropping others, and because it favors testimonies above documents. This peculiar historical orientation persists in the latest, third, edition, now published in Polish . . . which makes no room for the *Bauleitung* documents of the Central Archives in Moscow. This greatly lessens the veracity of this fundamental work, which unfortunately was composed with a vision a little too skewed in the strained political atmosphere of the 1960's [in Poland].

What Pressac is really trying to say here, God only knows. For many people, though, this is a work that comes straight from the Polish government's Auschwitz State Museum, and thus from the exploitation of Auschwitz by Russian and Polish Stalinism as an instrument to encourage anti-fascist sentiments in the West during the Cold War. We know well the real value of the "testimonies" that were mass produced at that time. If Pressac were really confident of sources of this kind, it would be logical for him to use them. But he shows the greatest mistrust. Nevertheless, his account of homicidal gassings comes *exclusively* from such sources, the value of which he himself acknowledges to be severely limited. These stories have already been published a thousand times. It was their internal weakness that moved Paul Rassinier to criticize them, and launch the movement now known as Holocaust revisionism. In continuing to use them, with only slight cosmetic adjustments, Pressac seems to make a fool of himself.

But the most extraordinary thing about Pressac's book is the pretense that it dispenses entirely with testimony to make its case. That is what Pressac claims to journalists. They swallow this lie because they more easily trust commentary than the text itself. By burying in the depth of his footnotes his use of the most hackneyed products of the Polish Stalinist dossier, Pressac thus appears to respond to the revisionists on their own ground, that of verifiable fact, as long as one accepts that the physical laws of nature are as valid today as in 1944–1945.

In chronicling Pressac's inconsistencies, I have refrained from referring to Pressac's earlier writings, comparing them with his most recent book. But others might be less indulgent and could be naughty enough to point out variations, reversals, and other shifts of position that such a reading would obviously disclose.

I shall also spare the reader a crucial facet of the discussion of basic facts, the capacity of the crematories in terms of their actual output (an appropriate term when speaking of an industrial facility). To be sure, Pressac clearly realizes that there is a difference between the outputs claimed by Topf company salesmen and the reality of operation, hampered by breakdowns and design and manufacture flaws. But Pressac goes no further to establish the actual figures, and when he provides an estimate of 1,000 cremations per day for Kremas II and III, one sees clearly that he takes his readers for chumps. In the most modern crematory facilities, the limit is four bodies a day per oven. In the largest Auschwitz crematory facility, Krema II (at Birkenau), with its 15 ovens, one might envision tripling or even quadrupling the rate. In that case a peak figure of 300 bodies per day could be attained (but at the risk of wearing out everything very quickly). Pressac carefully avoids venturing into this technical area. Elsewhere, he says that the "ideal" figures provided by the SS to Berlin are propaganda lies, but that they are nevertheless to be trusted (p. 80). In his latest book, Pressac carefully refrains from citing the figures for coal provisioning of the crematories, which appeared in his 1989 work.[7] In the light of those figures, it is all the more difficult to believe that two or three kilograms of coal would have been enough to burn a single corpse. If he had found in Moscow additional invoices to make his estimates less improbable, he certainly would have let us know about them.

In the main body of his new book, this macabre accounting is only marginally important. It becomes important only in Appendix Two, "The Number of Deaths at KL Auschwitz-Birkenau" (pp. 144–148), where Pressac uses his estimates of cremation capabilities to revise downwards the numbers given in the "testimonies" found in the *Kalendarium*, to simply decree that there were fewer trains, and that they carried fewer persons. He writes as if the arrival of the trains was pre-determined by the efficiency of the crematories. This is obviously absurd.

Other discrepancies occur in his calculations that I will pass over here. Regarding the deportation of Jews from Hungary (about which Rassinier had already noticed the impossibilities of the estimates of official Polish sources), Pressac rejects out of hand the estimates of Georges Wellers, telling us in passing that the Israeli Yad Vashem center holds documents showing that 50,000 Jewish women from Hungary were transported onwards from Auschwitz to Stutthof, near Gdansk/Danzig. (Because these Jews had not been registered upon their arrival at Auschwitz, they are normally considered to have been "gassed.") Pressac believes that there is a need for further research. With regard to the

number of Polish Jews who were deported, he mentions "the uncertainties of this question, due to an absence of documents."

To return to the question of the Jews deported from Hungary, Pressac places himself in untenable positions. For example, he accepts the stories about cremation pits, which have been completely disproved by the aerial reconnaissance photographs of Auschwitz taken by Allied aircraft at precisely that period. He does so because it is necessary to increase the theoretical cremation capacity in order to account for a theoretical total of 438,000 Hungarian Jews arriving at Auschwitz from Hungary. (This would have been twice the total population of Auschwitz at that time.) His abstract calculation (p. 148) is that the SS *could* have annihilated 300,000 persons in 70 days. But this raises a question: where could these 300,000 persons, dead or alive, have been herded or stockpiled during the two months it would have been necessary to burn them all? And why do we find no sign of them in the aerial reconnaissance photos?

Pressac arrives at a figure of 630,000 people who were supposedly gassed at Auschwitz. Several years ago, the Poles lowered their official figures of Auschwitz "gassing" victims. Raul Hilberg in the United States, Fraçois Bédarida in France, and Yehuda Bauer in Israel have each lowered his figures. Pressac lowers them still further. Now, just how and why were these figures lowered? Has some new information come to light? Not at all. The calculations are being fudged in other ways. Pressac, who is certainly foxy but also a bit naive, shows how to do the trick.

Because most of the figures of deportees are merely guesswork estimates, they are subject to change. Wellers "loaded" the rail convoys with 5,000 deportees each. Hilberg disagrees, finding that 5,000 persons per rail convoy is too many. So he simply says to hell with it, and decides on 2,000. If one calculates on the basis of 120 train convoys, this makes a big difference (240,000 compared with 600,000). Along comes Pressac, who is not happy with either of these — not on the basis of rail convoy capacity, but rather crematory capacity. Accordingly, he lowers (pp. 146–7) the figure of rail convoy capacity to 1,000–1,500. The day he realizes that his estimates of crematory capacities are illusory, and that cremation pits would have been visible from the air, he will have to lower them again. None of these calculators have gone to look in the archives. They've done it off the cuff. Thus, if the figures change, it's not because the documents demand it, but rather on the basis of the prevailing fashion and these calculators' hunches.

The Reception of Pressac

As has consistently been the case throughout the 15 years that this gas chamber controversy has been public, the most interesting aspect has been the behavior of the press. Its role in molding public opinion is crucial. Anyone who wants a clear understanding of the historical background and context of the so-called Holocaust must do a great deal of research precisely because the problems have not yet been fully clarified. In this, the journalists, and the experts whom they quote, are thus in a position to separate truth from falsehood and, for the public at large, to differentiate between the Good and the Evil. In two books,[8] I have attempted to chronicle this media agitation, of which the large-scale worldwide publicity for Pressac's book is the latest chapter.

It must be said that the Pressac media campaign has been carried out in fine style. Pressac, who had been rather quietly working in the shadows, so to speak, was launched into public awareness as if a public relations expert had masterminded the operation. *L'Express*, a leading French news magazine, was first to open fire, with a Depardon cover photo and a big headline: "Auschwitz: The Truth."[9]

Soon follows the *Nouvel Observateur*[10] with a weekend at Auschwitz with Pressac, along with the heavy artillery of the "leading specialists." *Libération*, a Paris daily, joins in with two pages and more photographs and documents.[11] *Le Monde*, another Paris daily, then appears with a half-page article from the pen of Laurent Greilsamer, who has followed the Faurisson affair in the courts for a long time. Then came a barrage of television and radio publicity. La Ville-du-Bois, the little town south of Paris where Pressac sells his drugs, hasn't known such uproar since the Hundred Years War.

"A work that will serve as a reference for historians of the whole world," said *L'Express*. Thanks to the Soviet archives "the first synthesis of knowledge of one of the most important events of the 20th century has been accomplished," *L'Express* went on to remark. This commentary is provided by someone named Conan and another chap called Peschanski, a research fellow who owes obedience to Bédarida.[12] The distinguished commentators affirm that both the decision for and the execution of the "Judeocide" (a new term that has yet to gain wide acceptance) were shrouded in "absolute secrecy," of which we might say that it still hasn't been pierced.

But why did the archives lie dormant? "Because an important current of Jewish memory refused any rational approach to the Final Solution, which was deemed an 'unspeakable' and 'unthinkable' event." One would prefer, of course, a more straightforward denunciation, naming names and citing references, but at *L'Express* prudence prevails. The idyllic situation at the archives was disturbed by the "literature of denial," which set about picking out the errors "logically numerous in witness testimonies or in the postwar Soviet texts that made Auschwitz a theme of ideological propaganda." The fine sleuths at *L'Express* haven't noticed that every single asser-

tion by Pressac regarding homicidal gas chambers is based directly on these very Soviet and Polish texts. But then one can't demand too much of journalists. It is Pressac who is supposed have personally discovered that "the technological history of the Final Solution still remains to be written." It is impossible for a well-bred journalist, as they prefer them at *L'Express*, to recognize that the father of this brilliant "discovery" (in France) is none other than Professor Robert Faurisson. After all, it wouldn't do to acknowledge that from that discovery on, every advance in this area owes something to him.

In his 1989 book — published in New York by the Klarsfelds — Pressac boasted that, on the basis of his work in the archives in Poland and Germany (50,000 documents), he was solving the riddle in its entirety. Now, he says, the 80,000 documents from the Soviets will tell us more. However, the 1989 work — of 564 large-size pages — was far more comprehensive, and dealt with many more subjects. Had the journalists done their homework, they would have recognized that Pressac's 1993 book is much more limited in scope, and is much more circumspect, indeed diffident, in its assertions than the 1989 work.

After having explained the book's stupefying discovery — that the administration administered, that the construction office made plans and requested estimates and invoices — the subtle analysts of *L'Express* assert that Pressac "found proof of the organization of the killing." There's the trick. Pressac swims in a sea of ambiguities. He does not positively state that he has found "proofs," but rather traces, or clues, which are almost as good as proof. Journalists can't afford to indulge in such subtlety, and Pressac makes no protest against their distortions. As in a child's game, he seems to say: "I didn't say it. He did." Pressac is always able, faced with real criticism, to take refuge in this infantile position. These "proofs," he writes (p. 82), are "precise indications" that "betray the rules of secrecy." This secret is so secret that it may not exist, Pressac himself having explained that there was no coding in the documents.

In the list of clues magically transformed into proof, the most ridiculous is not in his book but in what he told the press: "In a real morgue, there is a need to use disinfectants, like chlorinated water or cresol, but not a product for killing lice."[13] The pharmacist who sells drugs to his everyday customers obviously has no idea of the scale of the problems arising from a full-scale typhus epidemic. The crematories were built to deal with a situation in which 250 to 300 corpses, swarming with disease-bearing lice, were delivered *every day.*[14] Can one imagine heaping them up in the morgues without further ado? Sending in a team to wash them in chlorinated water, while in all the other facilities, including the barracks, Zyklon B was used to kill lice?

If these morgues had not been treated in an efficient way, they would have been great reservoirs of infection — biological bombs. Pressac, with his bottle of chlorinated water, is a public menace. He should lose his license as a pharmacist for daring to say such things. Why such an idiotic remark? To persuade the reader to believe that the morgues would have been the only place in the camp where the use of Zyklon would not have been normal. Because the SS knew about chlorinated water,[15] they had no need to disinfest the morgues with Zyklon. The logic here is ridiculous. But this reasoning has a hidden corollary: If the SS had used Zyklon in the morgues to protect the crematory personnel (themselves included), they could have done it only once in long periods. Without ventilation, the lethal gas would have stagnated. Consequently, they needed a ventilation system for these semi-underground rooms. This would explain why they requested the installation of such a system there.

Pressac rightly provides considerable detail about this. But because he has already concluded in advance — and without the least support from the 130,000 documents available to him — that the very existence of a ventilation system is a "clue" providing evidence of a homicidal plan, he must discard in advance any possible alternative interpretation. That is why the two *L'Express* journalists dutifully accepted, like holy water, this role of chlorinated water. Holy water for journalistic holy writ.

Similarly, the journalists have no problem forgetting about the January 1942 Wannsee Conference. They swallow Pressac's currently fashionable view as avidly as they swallowed, five or ten years ago, other authors who said just the opposite. Nothing else was to be expected. Journalists now easily accept the notion that, by late May or early June 1942, an anonymous "political will," of unidentified origin, "found [by some kind of chance] in the technical innovations [although, says Pressac, the oven technique is quite elementary and somewhat archaic] implemented at Auschwitz (thanks to engineer Prüfer) the means for an industrial-scale extermination." To put it in a nutshell, thanks to this obscure little engineer, a salesman of crematory ovens who receives a percentage cut from sales he makes for Topf company, the highest-level officials of Nazi Germany (who? Himmler himself?) would have said to themselves: "What a windfall! Hurray for Prüfer! Now we can really kill Jews!" Without wishing to seem overly critical, it is difficult to believe that a "genocide" of that alleged magnitude could have been decided in such a manner. For journalists turned historians, though, this latest revelation is as much revealed truth as the old one, and an act of faith costs nothing.

In the same way, these journalists have no trouble accepting without a murmur the numerical hocus-pocus that Pressac presents as "calculations." Without knowing why, we come down from 5.5 mil-

lion deaths at Auschwitz (the Soviet figure in 1945) to 800,000. The *L'Express* journalists even predict that these figures, as well as estimates of deaths in the other camps and in the ghettos will be similarly revised downward in the future. It appears to be a general trend, and readers should be ready for it. (Do they already have new figures in mind?) But, basically, none of this is very important, they add in closing, because "the nature of the Final Solution remains unchanged." Personally, I take the view that only religious dogmas never change. (And sometimes even they change.)

L'Express also published an article by Bédarida, sponsor of Pressac's work. The bédarida is a little known species of squid. It swims in the cultural soup and propels itself rapidly toward all directors' chairs, to which it adheres with strong suckers. Always on the defensive, it emits jets of ink to cloud its surroundings. Author of a thin but definitive booklet on "the Nazi Extermination Policy," Bédarida courageously acknowledged that he did not have "all the necessary knowledge" on this subject. He sees in Pressac a case of biological mutation (he "transformed himself into a historian"), and believes that this pharmacist has become "an incontestable, if not unique, expert." Contested he is, however, and not only by revisionists. Unique, perhaps, if one considers only Establishment history, produced by all sorts of bédaridas, and the effects of the anti-revisionist laws. When he adds that Pressac has subjected the documents to a "pitiless critique," he looks like a fool to the astute reader. He regards as "terrifying" a work devoted to the study of construction plans, ventilation problems, overheating and other matters that are the daily concern of every civil engineer. This characterization seems to me to show, among the squid, a tendency toward bombast. When he adds the words "an irrefutable terrifying work," he is hallucinating. There are answers. Bad luck for the squids.

How is it possible, asks the sucker,[16] that no one had looked into these questions before this? He could have told the plain truth: that it's because nobody knew how to respond to Professor Faurisson. (For years it was fashionable to say that he didn't even deserve a response.) No, Bédarida prefers to claim that in those days people instead emphasized the "perpetrators and the victims." And how to justify this late date — 15 years after Faurisson raised the matter? Bédarida's explanation — the opening of the Moscow archives — is pure eyewash. Pressac's wretched hodgepodge that supposedly "settled everything" was published in 1989 — before the opening of the Moscow archives. The only new thing culled from the 80,000 documents found in Moscow is the story of an apparatus produced by the Siemens company to kill lice with short waves. It seems that some experimental use was made of *this* machine at Auschwitz near the end of the war.[17] This was new for Pressac and for most of us. Should this machine be added to the long list of mythical industrial-scale installations, including the Jewish soap factories, the electrified swimming pools, the vacuum and steam chambers, the heated iron plates, the trains of quicklime cars, and so forth, which, although described in numerous and precise testimonies, have sunk into oblivion from whence they could be revived only through the immense talent of a Claude Lanzmann? Because it does not seem that this Siemens machine could kill people, it's been ignored. This is the big novelty from Moscow, suppressed for 45 years by the KGB!

In 1979 I rhetorically asked "how" before "why."[18] In 1993 the squid is still looking for "how and why." It's not historical research work that has made real progress in those years, but rather that a number of obstacles meant to prevent such research have been removed. The road is still not clear, but one day it certainly will be.

Journalist Claude Weill must have access to secret information because in the *Nouvel Observateur* he writes "that the existence of the gas chambers and the reality of the Jewish extermination policy have been overwhelmingly demonstrated. The evidence is available to anyone who can read and who is willing to open his eyes." I pray Mr. Weill to open my eyes, to make this evidence public so that Mr. Pressac's labors would become quite useless and thereby permitting him to concentrate on his work as a druggist.

Weill tells his own little story. He visits Auschwitz where he follows Pressac around, listening to his technical arguments. But after a while, he breaks down. These discussions are odious, and he asks Pressac to get to the point. The learned pharmacist responds: those who refuse to do scholarly and technical work "are making Faurisson's bed for him." This throws the journalist for a loop. Overwhelmed, he sadly faces the fact that history will win in the end, that the good times are over, and that "the Shoah will not escape the historians' cruel scrutiny." I didn't know that historians have a cruel look. Cruel for whom? This sentence says a lot, I think. But then the journalist can be pretty cruel himself: he cites figures of total deaths at Auschwitz provided by several earlier authorities, and crudely calls them "lies." The Pope, Willy Brandt, and many other important visitors to Auschwitz have bowed down before the memorial plaque there bearing these "lies." Considering how these official figures were arrived at, there's no reason why the latest figures supplied by Pressac won't one day also be called "lies."

In concluding his article, Weill expresses some skepticism. He finds some of Pressac's conclusions "hasty," the throwing overboard of the Wannsee Conference "not entirely convincing," the lowering of the number of victims "a bit imprudent." Pressac "has not closed the debate."

Not being fully convinced, this journalist needs

to cover himself. So the Grand Masters of the Official Truth are permitted to speak. The first is Pierre Vidal-Naquet, who introduced Pressac to the Establishment. The first thing he shows us is that, as usual, he can't read: Vidal-Naquet believes that the "point" made by Pressac about the precise date of the "first gassings" is derived from the Moscow archives. This is clearly wrong.[19] This "point" is actually the result of an argument typical of Pressac: he sees in the archives records that the buildings were not usually completed by the dates given by "authorities" (based on "memory"). Pressac then searches for the dates on which construction of the crematories were completed, then refers back to the *Kalendarium* (which is also largely based on "memory," and which even Pressac himself calls dubious) to determine what gassings took place that day. Evidently the Moscow archives make no mention of any homicidal gassings. As for Pressac's calculations, Vidal-Naquet finds them a bit hasty, too much based on assumption, it's "not so simple," "probably". . . The man who earned the *Légion d'Honneur* by dint of his anti-revisionist efforts prefers Hilberg's figures, which he calls "rather solid." Vidal-Naquet hesitates more than usual. He seems to be having second thoughts about his wisdom in launching Pressac, who has become the satellite of others and who threatens to crash land.

Then comes Raul Hilberg. After being grilled on the stand during the first Zündel trial at Toronto, in 1985, this professor of political science has learned to be more cautious.[20] He laments that Pressac isn't really a historian, that his is not the "the last word on the subject." He complains that "important research is still necessary," that "considerable research is still needed," that "the German sources should be studied further," and that there is still a lot of work to do. One wonders what this fellow's been up to since he began his study of this subject in 1948.

But Hilberg says something very embarrassing: an extermination order by Hitler has already been missing; now an extermination order by Himmler is likewise nowhere to be found. Höss and Himmler did not even meet "during the crucial period." What now? Is it Höss who decided everything by himself? Or was he in the dark as well? An extermination order by Höss to his subordinates cannot be found either. Another mystery. Perhaps we should ask Vidal-Naquet.

But the best, as usual, comes from Claude Lanzmann. He's a raw fundamentalist, dazed, totally inaccessible to the least reasoning, but with an animal's intuition. He showed this intuition in making the movie "Shoah," in which he abandoned all (or nearly all) reference to the documents. He knows the documents. He doesn't know what they really mean, but he has a photographic memory and rightly says that all the documents cited by Pressac were already known. Lanzmann defends his work as a movie maker in almost Célinian terms: art should create emotions, nothing else. ("I prefer the tears of the Treblinka barber to Pressac's document on the gas detectors"). Lanzmann is very modern; he likes to hit below the belt, crying to avoid thinking, toying with the macabre. Pressac's material "drives out emotion, suffering, death," he says. Lanzmann tramples on Vidal-Naquet, who licked his boots for years: "The sad thing is that a historian, his being doubtless threatened by the truth, the force, the evidence of the testimonies, does not hesitate to endorse this perversity [Pressac's book]. A historian abdicates before a pharmacist . . ."

Lanzmann smells a rat in Pressac. He understands much better than the media and academic crowd, which rushed to embrace Pressac in the hope of finishing off revisionism, that

> Faurisson is the only one this convert wants to talk to. To be listened to by him [Faurisson], he [Pressac] must speak his language, make his thought processes his own, accept his methodology, produce the crucial evidence, the *ultima ratio*, that will convince his former master . . . In order to refute the revisionists' arguments, one must give them legitimacy, and they thus became the central point of reference. The revisionists occupy the whole terrain.

The poor man is right. He must feel quite lonely with his useless reels. He had to first delay, and then completely reorganize his movie because of Faurisson's work. In fact the terrain is not occupied by the revisionists — who are persecuted everywhere — but by the remnants of an imploded belief. Lanzmann, late in life, has become the epic poet, the cantor, of this belief. It's not just the revisionists' questions that caused the implosion. Time destroys myths: *fugit irreparabile tempus*, irreparable time flies.

The *Libération* article is quite cautious. The journalist who wrote it sticks to Vidal-Naquet's 1979 phrase: "It [gas chamber killing] was technically possible because it occurred."[21] (The author of that phrase has been having regrets.)[22] The *Libération* journalist effortlessly swallows the fantastic element of Pressac's book: the technicians, the foremen of the private firms who took part in the construction of the crematories, "saw." It is an interesting use of the word. "They saw." These two words say it all: the entire story and its refutation. But it's pure speculation. Nothing in the documents indicates that "they saw" anything implied by this lapidary formulation. In his interview with *Libération*, Pressac is less than hinting broadly when he says calmly: "I was close to Faurisson, who trained me rather well in deniers' theory in the late '70s." And, further on, he returns to one of the most amusing arguments in his book: the only members of the *Bauleitung* who were ever tried, Dejaco and Ertl, in Austria in 1972, were acquitted because (he says)

the Austrian judges couldn't read a blueprint or a technical description. Nevertheless, the court had access to documents from the Moscow archives. The Austrians, therefore, were cretins who awaited, without knowing it, the light emanating from Pressac's pharmacy. But it seems that Pressac himself did not inquire into the trial of Prüfer, the Topf company engineer who designed the crematory ovens, which took place before a Soviet court in April 1948. The transcripts of the Prüfer interrogations must certainly be somewhere in the Russian archives. The Soviets of 1948, doubtless as stupid as the Austrians in 1972, did not believe that Prüfer was the prime mover of extermination (as Pressac argues). Well then, whose turn is it to go to the Moscow archives now?

I have kept the article in *Le Monde* for dessert.[23] Its author, Laurent Greilsamer, has long followed the judicial saga of Professor Faurisson, toward whom he has always shown the same hatred. That's why it's amusing to note that he praises Pressac exactly for what he found so blameworthy in Faurisson: for being an amateur historian, for starting with an examination of the weapon used in the crime, for being a pioneer, for being curious about everything, and for deliberately turning his back on the survivor testimonies to interest himself in the ruins and the documents. "Elementary," he says. This "elementary" weighs several tons of court papers! But there is more. Pressac's conclusions, writes Greilsamer, "revise, in the noble meaning of the term, that which the community of historians believed was established." How beautifully inspired is this revision "in the noble meaning of the term"! No camouflage, no coded language, everyone understands, we are in full clarity.

Why then, this journalist wonders with hypocritical anguish, hadn't anyone said these things earlier? "Fear of provoking a scandal," he writes. Pressac adds: "Because people weren't mature enough. The subject was too sensitive and the Berlin Wall hadn't yet come down. Don't forget that the history of Auschwitz was written in Poland by the Communists and that, even in France, the Gayssot law forbids free expression."[24] Revisions therefore had to be administered "in homeopathic doses." We have seen that Dr. Pressac, however, has used the opposite technique: a large dose of revision, coupled with intravenous injections of the Polish *Kalendarium* to sedate memory sufferings caused by amputation of illusions. The journalist is not sufficiently alert to ask what Pressac would write if there were no Gayssot law.

Pressac is happy to talk to *Le Monde*. An amateur, he can easily dismiss the intellectual establishment: "The researchers have kept quiet in order to hold onto their precious positions. There has been cowardice in the universities, and the revisionists have taken advantage of this for denial. Personally, I am doing the basic work. Anyone with common sense could do it." I love it.

He is more careful with the false "eyewitness" testimonies: "We shouldn't say they lied. We must take into account a factor of personal emotionalism." This is outrageous. Pressac knows full well that there have been deliberate, organized, profitable lies, which have nothing to do with "factors of personal emotionalism" (which may exist, surely, as in every testimony of whatever nature).

Lanzmann is right. Without Faurisson, there would be no Pressac. Pressac is 90 percent Faurisson, with the rest coming from easily identifiable and discredited sources. The media simply falls into line. One wonders who's more hypocritical: Pressac, who half saws away, in his notes from Höss and the *Kalendarium*, the branch on which he's sitting, or the journalists, who accept with joy and recognition from Pressac everything they rejected when it came from Faurisson?

There is, perhaps, a way out of this tangle. It is indicated in a remark by Bédarida (in *L'Express*). He says that Pressac was first attracted to revisionism but later refused to follow this group "on the road of denial." On the other hand, the Italian writer Umberto Eco said to *Le Monde* that revisionism is all right, that it's natural; it is possible to calmly discuss the documents, but one mustn't fall into "denial," which, he says, consists of denying that anything bad was done to the Jews during the Second World War.

I wonder if a new line is being drawn here. It makes a distinction between, on the one hand, revisionism, once again beautiful and good, exemplified by Pressac and his patrons and followers, who are obliged to adopt the revisionist method because it is the normal method of historical research, and, on the other hand, "denial," banished to the outer limits of taboo, including those who doubt the gas chambers, as well as (non-existent) deniers of the concentration camps, the rail deportations, and so forth. The consequence of this new view would be that revisionism, recognized at last, would demonstrate (in the style of Pressac, that is, sloppily) the existence of homicidal gas chambers, but in a way that they would lose their diabolical character. The death figures could be dropped much lower without infringing the nature of the *Shoah*. Faurisson and his associates would lose the use of their rational armament, captured by their enemies, and would be banished to the void by the Gayssot law. This might offer the best opportunity for the restored squids to pursue and enhance their brilliant careers.

Notes

1. *Le Monde*, Sept. 26–27, 1993, p. 7.
2. Robert Faurisson's *Journal* review of Lanzmann's movie, "Shoah," is followed by Ted O'Keefe's review of the book version. See: *The Journal of Historical Review*, Spring 1988, pp. 85–95.

3. Jean-Claude Pressac, *Les Crématoires d'Auschwitz: La Machinerie du meurtre de masse* ["The Crematories of Auschwitz: Machinery of Mass Murder"] (Paris: CNRS Editions, 1993), 155 (+ viii) pages. [German edition: Jean-Claude Pressac, *Die Krematorien von Auschwitz: Die Technik des Massenmordes* (Munich: Piper, 1994).];
   See Robert Faurisson's "brief, preliminary" critique of Pressac's 1993 book, in the Jan.-Feb. 1994 *Journal*, pp. 23–24.
4. *Nouvel Observateur*, Sept. 30–Oct. 6, 1993, p. 94.
5. Danuta Czech, *Kalendarium der Ereignisse im Konzentrationslager Auschwitz-Birkenau 1939–1945* (Rowohlt, 1989); English-language edition: Danuta Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle, 1939–1945* (London: I.B. Tauris, 1991).
   (Danuta Czech is head of the scientific research department of the Auschwitz State Museum in Poland.)
6. *Nouvel Observateur*, Sept. 30–Oct. 6, 1993, p. 94.
7. J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operations of the Gas Chambers* (New York: Beate Klarsfeld Foundation, 1989).
   Reviews and analysis of this book that have appeared in this *Journal* include: M. Weber, in Vol. 10, No. 2 (Summer 1990), pp. 231–237; C. Mattogno in Vol. 10, No. 4 (Winter 1990-91), pp. 461–485; R. Faurisson in Vol. 11, No. 1 (Spring 1991), pp. 25–66, and in Vol. 11, No. 2 (Summer 1991), pp. 133–175; A. Butz, Vol. 13, No. 3, (May-June 1993), pp. 23–37.
8. *Vérité historique ou vérité politique?* (Paris: La Vieille Taupe, 1980, 352 pages), and, *Une allumette sur la banquise*, (Paris: Le Temps irréparable, 1993, 330 pages).
9. *L'Express*, Sept. 23–29, 1993. (Eleven pages of text and photos.) The classic Orwellian translation of this headline would be: "Auschwitz: The Lie."
10. *Nouvel Observateur*, Sept. 30–Oct. 6, 1993, pp. 88–90, 92, 95–97. By Claude Weill, including interviews with J.-C. Pressac, Pierre Vidal-Naquet, Raul Hilberg and Claude Lanzmann.
    Eight pages are devoted to this trip, which calls to mind those Mediterranean cruises in which noted archaeologists act as tour guides. The allusion is quite explicit (p. 92): "Pressac runs through the ruins like an English archaeologist on the site of Ephesus." The image is revealing: the English were in fact the first, in 1863, to dig at Ephesus. It thus evokes a 19th century context, the beginnings of scientific archeology, the discovery or rediscovery of the great lost civilizations. Pressac, seen as an eccentric gentleman from an adventure novel, is about to reveal an unknown world for us. Everything we've known until now is made null and void by the triumphal "running" of the discoverer, resurrecting the past, and almost re-creating it.
11. *Libération*, Sept. 24, 1993, pp. 28–29.
12. Denis Peschanski is a research fellow with the Contemporary History Institute of the CNRS (Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique). Pressac's *Les Crématoires d'Auschwitz* was published under the guidance of Bédarida by the CNRS press. The cardinal principle of the world of Parisian literary criticism is well known: "No one is better served then by oneself — but it shouldn't show."
13. *Nouvel Observateur*, Sept. 30–Oct. 6, 1993, p. 84.
14. Information from the Auschwitz camp death registry volumes (*"Totenbücher"*), for the period of the epidemics. See: J.-C. Pressac, *Les Crématoires d'Auschwitz* (1993), p. 145.
15. Where, among the 130,000 documents, are the invoices for *chlorinated* water?
16. Presently glued to the chair of Secretary General of the International Committee of Historical Sciences.
17. J.-C. Pressac, *Les Crématoires d'Auschwitz* (1993), pp. 83 ff.
18. In "Le Comment du Pourquoi," 1979, which was included as the first part of *Vérité historique ou vérité politique?* (1980).
19. In an unforgettable article, published in 1980, Vidal-Naquet explained that because Faurisson had written something (supposedly) *faux* (false), he was a *faussaire* (forger). This may be found in Vidal-Naquet's book, *Assassins of Memory: Essays on the Denial of the Holocaust* (Columbia University Press, 1992). I dismantled this stupid pun and the poor arguments of Vidal-Naquet in *Une Allumette sur la banquise* (Le Temps irréparable, 1993). [*Assassins of Memory* is reviewed by Mark Weber in the Nov.-Dec. 1993 *Journal*, pp. 36–39.]
20. Although the media routinely calls Hilberg a "historian," that is not his profession. He, too, is another "amateur."
21. This phrase appears in the 1979 declaration co-authored by Pierre Vidal-Naquet and Léon Poliakov, which was signed by 34 scholars. It is quoted in the foreword to *Assassins of Memory* (p. xiv), and in *The Journal of Historical Review*: Spring 1983, p. 35; Summer 1985, pp. 166–167; and, Nov.-Dec. 1993, p. 38.
22. Regarding this phrase, Vidal-Naquet wrote, for example, in the review *L'Histoire* (June 1992, p. 51): "We were certainly wrong, at least in the form, even if the basis of our interrogation was justified." In fact, there never was any interrogation.
23. *Le Monde*, Sept. 26–27, 1993, p. 7.
24. Gayssot is a Communist member of the French parliament. The "Fabius-Gayssot" law of July 1990 forbids "contesting the crimes against humanity" as defined by the Nuremberg Tribunal, and specifies heavy fines and jail terms for violators. The law was passed as a trade-off between the Communists and the Socialists, to obtain continued support from the Communists in parliament for the Rocard government. I don't know whether this critical review violates the Gayssot law, but it's clear that Pressac's book (and thus all the press accounts of it as well) infringes the law seriously. [For more about this law, and the legal assault in France against Holocaust revisionists, see the *Journal*, March-April 1993, pp. 26–28.]

IN COLD BLOOD . . .

GRUESOME HARVEST: The Allies' Postwar War Against the German People, by Ralph F. Keeling, tells the grim, suppressed story of how the victorious Allies—after the end of the Second World War—carried on a brutal campaign against defeated Germany's civilian population. Completely reset attractive new IHR edition of a moving classic, with a new publisher's introduction by Ted O'Keefe. Bristling with contemporary documentation, burning with humanitarian and patriotic outrage, this informed, riveting classic dares to tell the shameful story of how American and other Allied policymakers undertook the political, economic and social destruction of the German people even as they presumed to instruct them in "justice" and "democracy." Softcover. 151 pp., $9.00 + $2 shipping.

A Pervasive Fear

JOSEPH SOBRAN

From time to time the press reports on polls measuring "anti-Semitism" in America, or recites numbers of "anti-Semitic incidents" (as defined and counted by Jewish organizations). In truth there is little active hostility to Jews in America, which is as it should be. But there is also very little public criticism of Jewish politics, which is another matter.

What polls don't and probably can't measure is the enormous fear of Jews that prevails in some parts of America, particularly in politics and the news media. People don't always admit fear to themselves, let alone to strangers. But it finds expression in many ways, most often in silence. Very few commentators dare to point out the obvious when it may reflect badly on Jews.

This has been true at least since World War II. And to some extent it can be excused as humanitarian concern for the rights of Jews, reinforced by a more specific apprehension of Nazi-like reprisals against all Jews if guilty parties were identified as Jews. But that explanation runs out of gas long before this point on the road. Today we find it rare to find culpable Jews identified as Jews even where it may be appropriate to point out that they are acting consciously as Jews.

A recent example is Pavel Sudaplatov's book *Special Tasks*, which alleges that J. Robert Oppenheimer and other Jewish scientists were motivated to leak nuclear secrets to the Soviet Union because they were persuaded that the Soviet Union provided a haven for Jews. Like other books that have raised sensitive questions about Jewish loyalties and their consequences for America, such as Victor Ostrovsky's *By Way of Deception* and Seymour Hersh's *The Samson Option*, *Special Tasks* has been the target of an intense discrediting campaign, and even when it has been discussed the Jewish angle has been played down or has even gone totally unmentioned. What makes these books especially explosive is that their authors are either Jewish or, in Sudaplatov's case, pro-Jewish, and can't be dismissed with the anti-Semitic smear.

To cite once more the case I know best, [*National Review* publisher] Bill Buckley warned me privately and urgently against criticizing Israel and thereby provoking the wrath of the Podhoretz crowd, whose charges of anti-Semitism he dreaded like Jove's thunderbolts; his book *In Search of Anti-Semitism* is written in the twisted prose of a man who is afraid of saying what he means — afraid of using his own mind, for fear of where it might lead him. And I've mentioned how shabbily he treated his own father in that book. But in fairness I should add that his father's record goes far to explain Bill's present concerns, though not as he describes them.

According to an old and now estranged friend of Bill named Revilo Oliver [a member of this *Journal*'s Editorial Advisory Committee], the elder William Buckley was "well known in certain circles for his discreet subvention of effectively anti-Jewish periodicals and his drastic private opinion about the aliens' perversion of our national life." And others have described Bill as (in the words of one friend) "terrified of his father's anti-Semitism" — terrified, that is, of being tainted by it. In his book, Bill makes it sound as if his father's hatred of Jews vented itself harmlessly in dinner-table talk. Evidently it went much further than that. So Bill may have thought he was protecting his father rather than disgracing him by telling as much (and as little) of the story as he did.

In one thing, though, Bill and his father are in accord; in their shared fear of the Jews. A recent issue of *National Review* carried an article by Elliott Abrams, Norman Podhoretz's son-in-law, blaming Christianity for anti-Semitism. This is the sort of propaganda Will Buckley was afraid would be disseminated in America if Jewish power continued to expand, but surely he would have been surprised to find it in his own son's magazine. Would Bill allow it into his pages if he weren't afraid to oppose Jewish influence?

And he is far from unique. I could make a long list of Christian conservatives — Judaeo-Christians, so to speak — who are equally timid; some of them mask their timidity behind belligerence against that great evil of our time, anti-Semitism, others pose as brave defenders of poor little beleaguered Israel. People have a way of praising what they fear, as everyone in Russia who dared to speak at all used to celebrate Stalin in the most fulsome terms. Yet looking back, we can now see that the praise itself was nothing but a barometer of inner dread, and the people who uttered it appear in retrospect as despicable, sometimes pitiable cowards. In the future I'm sure that the now-fashionable toadying to Jews will appear equally embarrassing, even to Jews.

The obvious question raised by such craven conduct is whether the prevalent "fear of the Jews" — the phrase recurs in the *Acts of the Apostles* — is rational or irrational. The news media certainly don't shy away from critical reporting on the Christian right or the Catholic Church, nor should they. But this is also to acknowledge that the Christian right and the Catholic Church accept criticism as legitimate or, at least, lack the clout to make it taboo. The organized though amorphous Jewish

---

Joseph Sobran has been a nationally-syndicated columnist since 1979. From 1972 to 1993 he worked for *National Review* magazine in various capacities, including 18 years as Senior Editor. He is the author of the book, *Single Issues: Essays on the Crucial Social Questions.* This essay is reprinted from the June 9 issue of *The Wanderer*, a Roman Catholic weekly.

power does neither. (It is of course important to bear in mind that most Jews aren't responsible for this, and it is morally and intellectually wrong to blame them indiscriminately; but I assume I am speaking to grownup Christians here.)

When I criticize Israel from the most obvious considerations of conservative principle and Christian-American interest, I find that other Christians regard me as either notably courageous or as simply foolhardy. I don't think I'm either (I generally dive for cover as quickly as the next man), but both opinions do show how *dangerous* people think the Jewish influence is — dangerous, at least, to anyone who wants a career in politics or journalism.

This intuition is basically correct. Bill in effect warned me that Jewish power would try to wreck my career if I didn't shut up. I didn't and it did. I found a great many markets quietly closed to me, certain invitations to write and speak ceased to come, and a lot of dark rumors got back to me. There have been many compensations, chief of which has been the sifting of true friends from false (I found Jews who were ready to help me when some of my Judaeo-Christian friends were in full flight), and I have found new markets for my services; but believe me, that bunch will do their best to ruin you if you suggest that Israel is anything but the best friend this country ever had.

This means that American public disclosure is being quietly and constantly warped by unseen pressures. It would be one thing if we simply had an explicit rule that criticism of Israel and Jewish political power is taboo. But an open taboo is almost a contradiction in terms: The essence of a taboo is the pretense that no subject is really being avoided, that (so to speak) there is no subject *there*. The power is immensely increased because it goes unmentioned, unmeasured, uncriticized. You can't even talk back to it if you can't talk *about* it. And public debate is obviously bound to be distorted if Jews may say things about Christians which Christians may not say about Jews; the Holocaust can be blamed on Christianity, but it might cause a certain disturbance if the Communist slaughters of Christians, or even Israeli treatment of non-Jews, were similarly linked to the *Talmud*'s teaching about Gentiles, or to its blasphemies against Christ.

The older I get, the more I am impressed by this pervasive fear of the Jews — or rather, pervasive in some critical power centers, unfelt in other places. It is a huge factor, invisible and incalculable, in American culture and politics.

Half-truth, hypocrisy and hate are departments in the art of demagogues. The polite phrase for all this is intellectual dishonesty.

— Herbert Hoover

The Martyrdom of the Russian Church Under Communism

As more archival material comes to light, it becomes clearer that no other Christian community in modern times suffered a greater martyrdom than Russian Orthodox believers endured during the Soviet era. The destruction of religion was a central, early fixation of Lenin — not just a Stalinist aberration. One of a large number of bloodthirsty orders of Lenin that have recently emerged includes, for example, the reluctance of a local church to hand over its religious treasures to the state. Lenin ordered that 100 priests be rounded up immediately, hanged and left to putrefy in public as a lesson to the nation. The church, which had re-established an independent patriarchate during the 1917 revolution, was subjected to prolonged humiliation. Nearly every major Russian religious thinker or leader was either exiled in the 1920s or killed in the 1930s. Old women in the gulags who wanted to conduct Easter services were forced to hold them knee-deep in water that was freezing around them.

The Russian Church defeated early Bolshevik efforts to supplant it by a puppet "renovationist" church, but made its Faustian bargain with communism in 1927, accepting a narrowly liturgical survival in return for docile support of Soviet policies ...

After a brief revival during the [Second World] war, the Russian Church was brutalized anew by Khrushchev, who shut half of the remaining churches and most of its surviving seminaries between 1959 and 1962. The survivors were forced into a firmer support of Soviet political positions in the World Council of Churches. Recently released archival materials show that there were links between the KGB and many members of the ruling synod of the Church during the last quarter-century of communism.

— James H. Billington in
The New Republic, May 30, 1994, p. 25

FALSEHOOD IN WARTIME

by Arthur Ponsonby, M.P.



First published in 1928, this trenchant volume authoritatively debunks numerous atrocity lies fabricated and circulated about the Germans during World War I. Learn how professional liars — three decades before the Holocaust story — manufactured such fakes as as a "German corpse factory," "the crucified Canadian," handless Belgian infants, and scores more with typewriter, scissors and paste to lead millions to misery, mutilation, and death. Lord Ponsonby's classic remains indispensable for anyone concerned to see through government and media lies today — and tomorrow. New softcover edition, 192 pp., $6.95 + $2 shipping from IHR.

Revisionist Radio Talk Show Tackles Important Issues

Radio talk show host Jim Floyd has been regularly delighting listeners across northern Alabama with an array of stimulating revisionist guests and his own probing questions and hard-hitting commentary. "The Jim Floyd Show" is broadcast every weekday morning, Monday through Friday, normally for one hour, 8–9 a.m. over station WAJF (Decatur), and simulcast on WHRT radio (Hartselle).

Recent guests have included:

• Prof. Tony Martin, who became a victim of threat and intimidation because he dealt with the historic Jewish role in the trans-Atlantic slave trade during a Wellesley College survey course;

• Rev. Dale Crowley, who has campaigned against anti-Christian propaganda at the US Holocaust Memorial Museum;

• Issah Nakleh, Palestinian historian and 1981 IHR Conference speaker;

• Paul Findley, former Illinois Congressman and outspoken critic of America's dangerously pro-Zionist Middle East policy; and,

• IHR adviser Friedrich Berg.

On June 3, *Journal* editor Mark Weber appeared as a guest, along with IHR advisor Robert Countess, for more than an hour. Noting the attention being given to the 50th anniversary of the D-Day landing in France, Weber spoke about media distortion of Second World War history. He also commented on the destructive military adventurism of recent American presidents, and discussed war propaganda generally. Jim Floyd's well-informed questions showed that he had done considerable background reading.

With the daily "Jim Floyd Show" in Alabama, and Brad Smith's recently inaugurated weekly radio program in Rhode Island, there are now at least two regularly scheduled radio programs through which revisionist views routinely reach the American public.

University Officials Block Talk by Prof. Butz

Just two hours before it was scheduled to begin, Northwestern University officials used chicanery to cancel a student-organized campus presentation by Associate Professor Arthur Butz, a prominent Holocaust revisionist.

School administrators barred the May 9 semi-formal "fireside" meeting on the pretext that the Public Affairs Residential College (PARC) dorm where it was to take place would immediately have to pay $1,500 from its "Student Organizations Finance Office" (SOFO) account to hire eleven security officers. Even though a member of the faculty, Prof. Charles Thompson, announced that he was willing to pay the required amount himself, the dean of the university college, Donald Collins, insisted that the money could only come from the SOFO account.

Dr. Butz is an Associate Professor of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science at Northwestern University (Evanston, Illinois). He is a member of this *Journal*'s Editorial Advisory Committee and author of *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, a major work disputing the orthodox Holocaust extermination story. The text of his address at the 1992 IHR Conference was published in the May-June 1993 *Journal*.

Dr. Thompson, a professor of industrial engineering, said he believed that the last-minute SOFO qualification requirement was part of the university's "campaign of intimidation" to prevent Butz from presenting his revisionist views about the Holocaust story.

Dan Prosterman and Bob Fabsik, two sophomore students who had worked to organize the "fireside" meeting, said that in light of the university's actions, they had no choice but to cancel the event. "It was very embarrassing for Bob and I to cancel," said Prosterman. "But [Butz] was not as upset as I thought he would be." (*The Daily Northwestern*, May 10.)

"He [Butz] said that this was the closest that he'd ever gotten" to addressing a meeting on campus about his revisionist views, said Prosterman, who also expressed anger at the University's last-minute financial requirement. "We are extremely upset at the way the university handled the event," he said. "A lot of the strife and conflict that has gone on in the dorm between us, and the dorm and the community could have been avoided."

PARC dorm students complained that the Butz meeting was cancelled because of a technicality. "If the administration had told us up front that we would have had to use SOFO funds, we never would have considered" organizing the meeting, said Prosterman.

Even though Butz did not speak, about 120 demonstrators rallied against him and Holocaust revisionism on the evening of the cancelled meeting. The protest rally was organized jointly by the Hillel Jewish student group and the International Socialist Organization (ISO), a Marxist group. Hillel Rabbi Michael Balinsky addressed the rally and thanked the demonstrators.

Peggy Barr, the university's vice president for student affairs, attended the Jewish-Marxist demonstration, and said she was pleased that the Butz meeting had been cancelled. ISO member Joel

Geier, told demonstrators that Butz "used to be just a kook that this university was stupid enough to protect, and now we see the rise of fascism once again. Why does the faculty still rub shoulders with him?"

The bigoted university action apparently does not reflect the sentiment of most students. A survey conducted in connection with the controversy showed that an overwhelming majority of Northwestern University students — 72 percent of those polled — believe that Prof. Butz should be allowed to speak on campus. (*Northwestern Chronicle*, May 27).

Editor Addresses Populist Party Meeting

Journal editor Mark Weber addressed the national convention of the Populist Party in West Palm Beach (Florida) on May 21. He was introduced by Don Wassall, chairman of the struggling dissident political group. Among the other speakers was Jim Townsend, editor-publisher of the *National Educator*, a weekly paper that has often supported the IHR.

Idaho Television Poll Shows Widespread Skepticism about Holocaust Story

Smith and Weber on "Schindler's List" Discussion

A recent poll conducted by an Idaho television station shows that one in four participants reject the Holocaust extermination story.

On the evening of March 22, Twin Falls (Idaho) television station KKVI (an ABC network affiliate) aired a special report and discussion program devoted to Steven Spielberg's Holocaust movie "Schindler's List." A three minute telephone interview with *Journal* editor Mark Weber, which had been recorded the day before, was aired as part of the program. In addition, CODOH chairman Brad Smith appeared by telephone hookup as a live guest, along with a World War II veteran. Mention was made during the broadcast of the appearance of Weber and Smith two days earlier on the CBS television network's "60 Minutes" program. (For more about that, see the May-June 1994 *Journal*.)

Shar Alexander, who conducted the interview with Weber, later said that she was very pleased with the public response to the program, which she described as "wonderful." People were still talking about it a week later, she said.

Viewers of the KKVI television report and discussion were invited to respond to a telephone poll organized by the station. (Viewers can call a telephone number and, by using a touch tone phone, vote Yes or No.) The question was: "Do you believe that the Holocaust really occurred?" Alexander said that she and the others at the station were astonished by the viewer response: One out of four voted No.

Holocaust Skeptic Almost Wins US Congress Nomination

A New Jersey man who is openly skeptical of the Holocaust extermination story recently almost became the Democratic Party's candidate for US Congress in the state's 11th District. Receiving 48 percent of the vote, John L. Kucek — a 67-year-old Certified Public Accountant, US Army veteran, and former business manager — barely lost the June 7 primary election race.

"I do not believe that there was any deliberate extermination plot against Jews or anyone else," said *Journal* subscriber Kucek during an interview last fall. "The Auschwitz so-called gas chambers are documented to have been a fabrication." In a more recent interview, he said: "If there were 400,000 survivors of the concentration camps, and over four million Jewish survivors collecting reparations from the German government . . . Apparently, there couldn't have been six million who died." ("Holocaust skeptic is likely nominee for Congress," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, May 30.)

Kucek, who was denounced for his views by Jewish leaders and regular Democratic party leaders, describes himself as a "traditional Democrat in the tradition of Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson and Al Smith." Kucek favors sharp limitations on immigration. He has cited "distorted" and "vicious" media coverage as major reasons for his defeat.

Weber Heard in Los Angeles

A portion of a previously-recorded interview with *Journal* editor Mark Weber was broadcast April 13 over Los Angeles radio station KFI, one of the most widely heard in the western United States. Hundreds of thousands heard Weber talking about the "victimization" phenomenon whereby various racial-ethnic groups cite a record of past persecution to claim moral standing in our society.

The complacent, the self-indulgent, the soft societies are about to be swept away with the debris of history.

— John F. Kennedy,
Address to newspaper editors,
April 20, 1961

Reviews

A Non-Polemical Look at Wartime Germany's Atomic Bomb Program

Heisenberg's War: The Secret History of the German Bomb, by Thomas Powers. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993. Hardcover. 608 pages. Notes. Bibliography. Index. $27.50. ISBN 0-394-51411-4.

Reviewed by Andrew Gray

"In the years since Hiroshima," Thomas Powers writes in a luminous introduction to a superb book, "the makers of the American bomb have all made peace with their creation. They have been asked a hundred times if they feel guilt. They say no and they mean no. Hitler might have done it first . . . But with the Germans they have not made peace, only kept a polite silence. Just what went wrong with the German bomb program they are not sure, but on one point they are dead certain — *no moral compunction on Heisenberg's part, however tenuous, played a role.*" (emphasis in the original).

The evidence suggests otherwise — and massively. Much of this indictment of American hypocrisy, of a double standard, of wartime propaganda continuing in peacetime guise, is based upon the work of David Irving, whose interviews in 1965 and 1966 with Werner Heisenberg, head of wartime Germany's atomic bomb development program, provided the foundation for his 1967 work, *The German Atomic Bomb* (Simon & Schuster). Irving's interviews, Powers emphasizes (unsurprisingly for revisionists), elicited a greater candor from Heisenberg than those of any other historian. Beyond this, Irving has made available to Powers his microfilm files on the subject. Together with much newly available material (including expanded though not complete access to the transcripts of recorded conversation among the German physicists during their internment in England in the summer and autumn of 1945), these documents permit Powers to build a case strong enough to raise permanently the level of debate on the subject.

Yes, the German physicists, with few exception, *did* have moral scruples about any serious efforts to produce nuclear weapons for the Hitler regime, and these scruples *did* have practical effect. "The implication that Allied scientists," Powers continues, "— many of them Jewish, many driven from Germany, many bereaved in the Holocaust — might have some moral obligation to answer questions posed, however indirectly, by Germans is more, as I have more than once experienced, than they are ready to tolerate in silence." Silent or not, this volume leaves them no choice in the matter.

This book actually blends two subjects, one somber and the other hilarious. World history, of course, was at stake in the vicissitudes of German nuclear weapons research. The might-have-beens are stupefying, and not an appropriate subject for the author's iridescent irony. Not so, by contrast, his lengthy account of the efforts of US wartime intelligence (chiefly "Wild Bill" Donovan and his Office of Strategic Services) to find out what the Germans



Werner Heisenberg with two of his sons, in the late 1940s. Awarded the 1932 Nobel Prize for physics "for the creation of quantum mechanics," Heisenberg headed wartime Germany's atomic research program. His work on the quantum theory profoundly influenced the development of atomic and nuclear physics.

Andrew Gray, a writer and translator, is former office director in the US Department of Commerce. He lives in Washington, DC.

were up to. On the basis of their Ultra decrypts (which contained not even the most tangential reference to a German equivalent of the Manhattan Project, nor any mention of Heisenberg by name), British intelligence concluded early in the game that there would be no German atomic bomb, whereas Americans feared the worst almost to the end of the war. These fears culminated, it seems, in an OSS plot to kill Heisenberg, though this was originally disguised as a kidnapping venture under the auspices of a desperado named Eifler. "It didn't require a professional odds-maker," Powers observes, "to see that the chances were remote at best that Heisenberg would survive a kidnapping in Germany, a forced march into Switzerland, a secret rendezvous with an American military plane and a parachute drop onto some map coordinate in the Mediterranean where a submarine might or might not be waiting. Eifler was left in no doubt that Heisenberg's survival was not the mission's highest priority."

How interesting that a mainline publishing house such as Knopf remains capable of issuing a book that does not demonize the Third Reich or engage in any of the customary myth-making. The burden that any totalitarian regime imposes on science is evocatively rendered, but without the implicit claims to moral superiority that have pervaded most prior writings on the subject from these shores, or the post-war denigrations by Heisenberg himself for his decision to remain in Germany. Heisenberg himself shines through the text as a deeply decent person — a bit tactless now and then, perhaps, and not long on humor, but compared, let us say, to J. Robert Oppenheimer, a paragon of stability and humaneness.

The book contains considerable duplication of material and would have benefited from one last editorial combing-out, but that is true of almost every product of American presses, trade or academic, these days. For the most part, German names and quotes are rendered accurately, a healthy contrast to current standards, though it is a bit disconcerting to find the name of Colonel Stauffenberg repeatedly misspelled. Even the most casual proofing eye should pick up this sort of error.

The story has a happy ending, although the author prefers to leave it implicit. German physics is again thriving, thanks in large part to the continuity Heisenberg maintained for it. This was his specific and avowed intention. Never anti-Semitic — his rivals in the 1930s termed him a "white Jew" at one point — he nonetheless believed it a German science, par excellence, which it is.

Truth is strong, next to the Almighty. She needs no policies, no stratagems, no licenses to make her victorious.

— John Milton

Secretary Shultz and the Bitburg Uproar

Turmoil and Triumph: My Years as Secretary of State, by George P. Shultz. New York: Scribner's, 1993. Hardcover. 1184 pages. Photographs. Index. $30.00. ISBN 0-684-19325-6.

Reviewed by Andrew Gray

A hefty tome, but after all, George Shultz is an ex-professor, and obviously does not wish to be outdone by Dr. Kissinger. Buried in this long and discursive text, however, is a nugget for revisionists — 20 pages devoted to the story of President Reagan's much-criticized May 1985 visit to the German military cemetery at Bitburg. Candor on this subject was not to be expected from ex-President Reagan, and this account by the former Secretary of State is the most accurate we have been accorded to date from any of the principal figures in the drama. All of which isn't saying very much — we will no doubt have to wait for Patrick Buchanan to tell the tale as he experienced it for a remotely adequate version.

At any rate, the Bitburg crisis remains a central event of the time — an embarrassment to those who raised the uproar against the Presidential visit to the Bitburg cemetery and a salutary lesson for them and for everyone else. At issue was a specifically Jewish bid for veto power in government-to-government relations between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany. Had this been granted at Bitburg, the World Jewish Congress would no doubt have demanded and received a seat at the table at which German reunification was negotiated five years later, though in such a case, there would probably have been no German statesman on the scene with sufficient prestige to negotiate the matter in the first place. We could only sense it at the time, but the prospects for German reunification were at stake in the concerted Jewish assault on Helmut Kohl. World leaders live by and on prestige.

If Ronald Reagan had deserted the German chancellor, Kohl would have been revealed as a *Gummilöwe*, a "rubber lion," like his predecessor Ludwig Erhard, a man without clout when push came to shove. Instead — after facing down combined Jewish power and hysteria — the chancellor emerged as a man who could later negotiate the withdrawal of the Soviets from Central Europe with Mikhail Gorbachev one-on-one, that is, with barely a nod to the president of the United States, whom he considered an interested bystander in the transaction.

Of course George Shultz doesn't say any of this. At the height of the uproar, he admits joining the chorus of those advising the President to cancel the Bitburg visit. Shultz is an ex-Marine, who has seen first-hand the most brutal forms of combat the

Pacific War produced, but he proves predictably incapable or unwilling to draw even the most obvious parallels with the Waffen SS. No, his is the same old litany, compete with ignorant reference to the Oradour tragedy, with is regularly served up in the propaganda-tinted history we receive from official sources as a "massacre" supposedly typical of Waffen SS units in action. Well, there were no doubt some Abolitionists who spat on the graves of Confederate dead, but by and large Confederate cemeteries have been honored even by the most convinced Unionists as symbolizing the bravery and spirit of self-sacrifice of those lying buried within them. One would think George Shultz of all people might accord such dignity to the German dead at Bitburg, but not at all — "Hitler is laughing in hell right now," he recalls telling his subordinates before leaving for Germany to accompany the President. "The idea of the visit, reconciliation, had been destroyed. Kohl has butchered it. He told us there were no SS buried at Bitburg. Teltschik said there were none."

It gets worse. "Just before leaving for Bergen-Belsen," Shultz writes, "I pulled out of my pocket a small lapel pin with a German emblem on it. It symbolized a decoration, the Grand Cross of the Order of Merit, that I had received in 1974 from the German government . . . I asked Rick Burt, Bernie Kalb and Charlie Hill whether I should wear this little button on my lapel. Immediately a fierce debate erupted . . . I sighed and put the little pin away." If this were typical of the Marines, we would still be fighting on Guadalcanal.

At all events, the eight minutes Ronald Reagan spent at the Bitburg cemetery were arguably the apogee of his presidency. It was not merely a lesson for Jewish organizations alone — no, it was a demonstration to the combined power of the American media that they, too, could not command and control the American state on a fundamental German-American issue. This obviously came as a great surprise to many people, some of whom have not recovered from it yet. Perhaps this accounts in part for the pusillanimity of the Shultz version of this crisis, and for the remarkable fact that the German Chancellor himself declined to permit the author to quote in full his confidential message to President Reagan of April 15, 1985, in which Kohl made the visit an *Existenzfrage* for himself and his administration. There is much more to come on this subject, and it is likely to be tasty for revisionists.

When preparing your will or trust, please consider a bequest to the Institute for Historical Review.

For information, write:
Director, IHR
P.O. Box 2739
Newport Beach, CA 92659

A BOLD BLOW AGAINST THE CONSPIRACY OF SILENCE



Timely, powerful, breathtaking. *This is a painful book to read, yet hard to put down. Its impact is profound. Let us hope that this important book does not itself become another victim of the conspiracy of silence, and that it gains the attention it deserves.*

—Richard J. Herrnstein
Professor of Psychology, Harvard University

THERE IS NO MORE COMPELLING ISSUE confronting Americans today than that of race. And yet there is no other issue in which the gap between private beliefs and public discussion is wider. Many Americans have succumbed to the notion that it is somehow wrong to be forthright about questions of race; that decent, intelligent people should not candidly discuss what's wrong; that the only acceptable debate must take place in an arena circumscribed by taboos.

Jared Taylor wants to reopen this debate. He believes that unless we can be forthright about race issues, unless we can ask the right questions and receive honest answers, we have little chance of solving the problem. And if we don't solve the problem, the race situation can only worsen.

This is the most important book about race relations in America to be published in a generation. It unflinchingly explores the failed consequences of laws and regulations that have turned the ideal of equal opportunity on its head, and it suggests approaches to festering social problems that today appear to be beyond our ability to remedy, or even grasp.

Paved With Good Intentions boldly argues that as long as whites are held chiefly responsible for the situation of blacks, policies such as affirmative action and quotas, perceived to penalize one group to reward another, will only make matters worse.

PAVED WITH GOOD INTENTIONS
The Failure of Race Relations in Contemporary America by Jared Taylor
Cloth, 416 pages, Notes, Index
$22.95 + $3 shipping
available from
Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739
Newport Beach, CA 92659

Letters

Corrective Power

Richard Phillip's letter [in the May-June *Journal*, pp. 46-47] is an excellent illustration of the corrective power of historical revisionism. However, a few of his points require correction.

German Chancellor Otto von Bismarck tried to appease France over the issue of Alsace-Lorraine, and nearly succeeded in reaching a reconciliation.

It is not true that Germany "struck back so furiously 20 years later," that is, in 1940. British historian A. J. P. Taylor and American historian David Hoggan have each disposed of this widely held myth. Under Hitler, Germany peacefully retrieved lost territories and lost populations, usually to the thunderous applause of the people involved. The hybrid Czecho-Slovak state dissolved in 1939 without resistance, and Poland was attacked by Germany later that year only after prolonged provocation. Hitler was never serious about invading Britain, and would have withdrawn from France in exchange for peace with Britain. German expansion into Eastern Europe threatened no one but the Soviets, who had expansionist plans of their own.

Aside from the knotty historical question of war guilt, everyone can easily grasp the basic validity of the revisionist maxim that no side in a military conflict (including Hitler) is ever entirely morally pure. Revisionism benefits everyone of good will who seeks truth.

W. R. W.
Walnut Creek, Calif.

Understanding for Baltic Peoples

I am skeptical whenever I read about another elderly naturalized American citizen who is accused of committing "Nazi war crimes." One recent case involves a 72-year-old Latvian immigrant in very poor health who had been living in western New York State. He is accused of having been a member of a Latvian police unit that supposedly killed Jews during the German wartime occupation of his country.

It isn't difficult to understand why people in the Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania hated and feared the Soviets. At the end of the Second World War the father of a friend of mine escaped from Estonia and emigrated to the United States. As my friend explained to me, shortly after the Soviet occupation of Estonia in 1940, the Soviet secret police, the NKVD, set up street barricades. The NKVD police stopped all men who appeared to be between the ages of about 20 and 55, and forced them to hold out both hands. Those who did not have callouses were considered to be elitists, and were immediately shot by the NKVD. My friend's father, at the risk of life, took a photo of one such shooting with a concealed camera. (Fortunately, he was a manual laborer.) Ironically, many of those who passed the "callous test" were later shipped to Siberian labor camps, in part because they were considered to be hard workers. Many others disappeared without a trace. Many NKVD officers were Jews.

One can hardly blame the many people in the Baltic states, White Russia (Belarus) and Ukraine who chose during the Second World War to fight alongside the Germans for the freedom and independence of their nations.

R. B.
Paradox, N.Y.

Subtle Impact

The work of revisionists appears to have made a subtle impact on Spielberg's Holocaust epic, "Schindler's List." Although it includes many rather ridiculous scenes, such as German officers who are almost constantly drunk while on duty, or lusting after Polish Jewish female laborers, I suspect that Spielberg, with an eye to the ages, has tried to make a film that will better stand up to the scrutiny of future generations. Consider the following;

1. Execution gas chambers are first orally rumored, and then visually suggested by heavy fire and smoke from a chimney at Auschwitz, but the "Bath and Disinfection" chamber shown (and accurately depicted) is used only for showers. One Jewish woman suggests, quite logically, that rumors of "gassing" could not be true, because anyone so close to such an apparatus would not be permitted to survive to tell the story.

Since rumors and suggestion are, in fact, the basis of the entire gas chamber extermination story, all this seems rather fair. Also, because the chimney shows heavy smoke, unlike a crematory chimney, they could be burning trash for all we know.

2. An entire trainload of people arrives at Auschwitz, the inmates are well cared for, and then they safely leave the camp through the same gate on another train. What other Hollywood film has ever suggested that Auschwitz also functioned as a transit camp?

3. Indiscriminate shootings of entire communities are not shown, only shootings of individuals, particularly as saboteurs.

J. S.
Silverado, Calif.

Verge of Victory

The May-June 1994 *Journal* was, as usual, fascinating. I read the entire thing in one sitting. I showed the article about the "60 Minutes" broadcast [devoted to

Holocaust revisionism] to intellectuals I know who had been hoodwinked by the CBS presentation. After reading your article, each one changed his view.

Holocaust revisionism is on the verge of victory. Keep the *JHR* focused on this issue. I've won a renowned professor of history to our view on this.

P. G.
Lyndhurst, Ohio

Disappointment With Nolte Interview

Reading Dr. Warren's interview with Prof. Ernst Nolte, and Weber's review of Nolte's most recent book, *Streitpunkte* ("Points of Dispute"), in the January-February *Journal* was, unfortunately, a disappointment. Much of what Nolte says in this interview is nonsense, particularly his views about the Third Reich and National Socialism.

For decades now, Prof. Nolte has been one of the most prominent "re-educators" here in Germany. He is regarded as an expert on "fascism," whatever that means. (There was never any "fascism" in Germany.) In my view, he is a blatant opportunist who wishes at all costs to avoid giving any kind of offense.

Several years ago he initiated an exchange of letters with me that showed that he is not at all inclined to give validity to arguments against the Holocaust story, even if, at the same time, he gives the impression that he does not refuse to discuss this issue, and believes those who discuss it should not be punished. Consequently, I discontinued our exchange of letters as pointless. I cannot avoid the view that, in light of the increasingly obvious changes in how the Holocaust story is regarded, he is trying, to a certain degree, intellectually to "protect" himself.

After the "Leuchter Report" was made public, Nolte criticized it in an essay published in a German newspaper, without, of course, citing any effective arguments against it. Nolte concluded his essay by writing that he would not be convinced, even by a "better" forensic report, that Jews were not murdered in gas chambers. What a revealing statement by a man who calls himself a "scholar."

The so-called "historians' dispute" ("*Historikerstreit*") in Germany was a kind of "shadow boxing." Nolte sought to make more of a name for himself in this "dispute," and was entirely misunderstood by his adversaries. What the Germans did to the Jews, writes Nolte in *Der europäische Bürgerkrieg* ("The European Civil War"), was an act of "transcendental annihilation." This "attempted complete annihilation of a world-nation is quite significantly different than all [other] acts of genocide," Nolte contends, because it was not "merely" an act of "biological annihilation," but was a "decision against progress"!

In his book *Der Nasenring* ("The Nose Ring"), Swiss-born historian Armin Mohler aptly comments (pp. 210–211) that, far from "relativizing" German crimes, as his adversaries charge, Nolte actually provides the "most radical cementing known to us" of the notion of the "singularity of the German crime."

Incidentally, a very instructive critique by Manfred Köhler of Nolte's *Streitpunkte* has just recently been published (in German) by Cromwell Press in England [27 Old Gloucester St., London WC1N 3XX].

(Dr.) Wilhelm Stäglich
Glücksburg, Germany

Veteran Recounts Mistreatment of Prisoners

I served in the US Army during World War II, and was wounded in Belgium. I spent a lot of time in Germany during and after the war.

Many people are reluctant to believe that the United States could have mistreated German prisoners in the way that James Bacque relates in his book, *Other Losses*. I can attest to the fact that the US Army did have those inhumane holding pens for German prisoners: I saw them! These were guarded, fenced-in areas with thousands of German Prisoners of War inside, and there were no interior buildings or shelters. The POWs looked very thin and drawn. This was months after the war was over. They should have been released when the war was over.

Gruesome Harvest [also available from the IHR] is another book that accurately tells of the shameful treatment by the Allies of German civilians and prisoners of war. After the war the Germans had very little food. Old women and children would station themselves outside the [US military] mess halls with two buckets, one for food scraps that normally go into the garbage cans and the other for left over coffee from the GI canteen cups. No food scraps or coffee ever hit garbage cans. I would always go back for seconds so that I would have a full mess kit and canteen cup for them when I left the mess hall. I also gave them other food items and soap that I had, much of which was sent to me from home.

I didn't get home until March of 1946, so I was witness to many things mentioned in these two truthful books.

Even after all these years I am still bothered by the indiscriminate Allied bombing of German cities, killing thousands of civilians needlessly, and the Allied treatment of Germans after the war. This is a shameful period in our history.

The Germans were good Christian people, and it is too bad that they weren't treated in a Christian manner by the victors.

Oscar E. Plummer
Clinton, Ill.

We welcome letters from readers. We reserve the right to edit for style and space.

A SPECTACULAR REVISIONIST LINE-UP FROM IHR'S SOLD-OUT ELEVENTH CONFERENCE!

You Are There With Audio and Video Recordings of Conference Lectures
Don't Miss a Word of These Informative, Entertaining Presentations

TOM MARCELLUS, MARK WEBER: Opening and keynote of the Eleventh Conference. Director Marcellus greets the two hundred attendees and speakers, then *Journal of Historical Review* editor and conference emcee Weber weaves a spellbinding tapestry of recent IHR triumphs and future challenges, expertly (and entertainingly) setting the Revisionist agenda in today's world-wide political and intellectual context. Learn how, and why, IHR's enemies are atremble, from Beverly Hills to Jerusalem!

JAMES J. MARTIN: The Dean of Historical Revisionism returns after a nine-year absence to dedicate the Eleventh to George Morgenstern, the *Chicago Tribune* editor and historian who wrote the first, and in many ways the best, book on FDR's "day of infamy" at Pearl Harbor. Dr. Martin gives his listeners not a lecture, but a seminar in the history of the rise of America's ill-starred interventionism in East Asia, 1898-1941, sparkling with dry wit, humane insight, and scholarly precision.

WILLIS CARTO, ERNST ZÜNDEL: IHR's founder introduces the video Ernst Zündel sent "just in case," (yes, once again our State Department was able to deny us our right to hear him), then the German-Canadian battler exults in his hard-won triumph (which saw Canada's highest tribunal strike down the obscure and obscurantist "false news" statute under which he was twice convicted for publishing a Revisionist book). Then Ernst thanks the many who supported him in so many ways, reaffirms his devotion to rehabilitating his German fatherland, looks ahead to the continuing struggle, and hails the coming, final victory. Includes Willis Carto presenting Ernst with the IHR's 1992 George Orwell Free Speech Award.

FRED LEUCHTER: America's leading expert in the design and operation of gas chambers, and the author of the earth-shaking technical study that smashed the Auschwitz gassing lie, describes his own "botched execution" at the hands of Zionist terrorists and their cat's-paws in America: how he licked their efforts to rob him of his freedom, how he's fighting their campaign to steal his livelihood, and the inside story of his unlawful arrest and expulsion from Great Britain.

KIRK LYONS: The U.S.A.'s counterpart to Ernst Zündel's battling barrister, Doug Christie, attorney Lyons describes his defense of Fred Leuchter, then outlines what's needed to organize a great legal counteroffensive against the enemies of freedom and truth. A rousing call to arms from America's foremost legal defender of the "politically incorrect." Leuchter and Lyons on one tape.

TED O'KEEFE: IHR editor O'Keefe tells how Holocaust survivor Mel Mermelstein, self-styled "best witness" to the Auschwitz gas chambers, was whipped on the law and the facts in Los Angeles Superior Court in September 1991, ending his ten-year campaign to bankrupt the IHR. O'Keefe tells how he gathered and evaluated the crucial evidence under the direction of defense attorneys Mark Lane and Bill Hulsy, then supplies the hilarious details of how "eyewitness" Mermelstein's libel and conspiracy suit collapsed before the horrified eyes of his high-priced Jewish lawyers as his credibility crumbled on the witness stand.

BRADLEY SMITH: Longtime director of IHR's media outreach campaign, and organizer of last year's immensely successful project to alert campuses across America to the case against the "Holocaust," Bradley Smith has never been in better form as he tells what *really* prompted him to go with full-page ads in college newspapers, and what it takes to be a full-time Holocaust Revisionist, at home and over the airwaves. You'll laugh and learn as Brad recalls Robert Faurisson's frank assessment of him as an American intellectual, and advances his own proposals for artistic tributes to Holocausters Marvin Hier and Simon Wiesenthal. Great fun!

DAVID COLE: A 23-year-old American Jewish Revisionist tells how he came, first to doubt and then to challenge, the gas-chamber stories. The young movie-maker who filmed and produced Brad Smith's video interview with Mark Lane and appeared with Mark Weber on the nationally televised Montel Williams Show) recounts his recent trip to gather material for a film documentary on Auschwitz (where Ernst Zündel was his guide), above all his extraordinarily revealing, filmed interview with the research director of the Auschwitz State Museum, Franciszek Piper. Moving, informative, sensational! Smith and Cole on one tape.

JEROME BRENTAR: Jerry Brentar, the most valiant and persistent defender of John Demjanjuk, discusses, for the first time before an IHR audience, his *own* role in fighting and exposing the OSI-Israeli-Soviet frame-up of the Ukrainian-American falsely convicted in Jerusalem as "Ivan the Terrible" of Treblinka. Jerry tells of his search for evidence on three continents; his personal experience with the skullduggery and treachery of the OSI; his 1988 "expulsion" from George Bush's presidential campaign; and his key part in educating Demjanjuk defenders like Congressman Jim Traficant (D-OH), and journalist and presidential candidate Pat Buchanan.

AHMED RAMI: The gallant Moroccan officer in exile who has become a radio apostle of Revisionism in Sweden greets the conference in French, then Robert Faurisson reads (and comments) on Rami's lecture in English. Rami tells of his trial, conviction, and jail sentence for "lack of respect" for Jews in Sweden, and how he turned his time in prison into a Revisionist seminar for guards and inmates alike. He and Dr. Faurisson give a witty rendering of Faurisson's adventure in Sweden, then Rami offers an Arab and Islamic perspective on the Holocaust, as well as experienced advice on using mass media in the battle of ideas.

WOLF R. HESS: The son of Rudolf Hess, the twentieth century's Prisoner of Peace, talks about the life and death of his father, Adolf Hitler's deputy, whose bold flight to Scotland to seek an end to World War II resulted in 46 years of imprisonment, and, Wolf Hess argues convincingly, his father's murder at the hands of his captors. In this video presentation, filmed in Germany just days before the conference, Wolf Hess offers dramatic new evidence and incomparable personal insight into his father's witness and martyrdom for Germany and world peace.

ARTHUR R. BUTZ: The author of *Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, the seminal work of modern Holocaust Revisionism, prefaces his formal lecture with a background on the origins of Brad Smith's Campus Project at Northwestern University, where he is a professor. Then Butz uses the most complete collection of German documents on the Auschwitz crematoria ever published, Pressac's *Auschwitz*, to propound a brilliant and devastating (for the Exterminationists) new hypothesis on the planning and construction of the crematoria at Auschwitz. A vital update to *The Hoax* that every Holocaust Revisionist will want to own.

ROBERT FAURISSON: The peerless Revisionist from France first delivers a funeral oration over the cadaver of the-Holocaust-as-history, then proclaims the bad tidings: that the hoax is being resurrected, this time as a religion impervious to historical analysis, by its High Priests around the world. Professor Faurisson brings news of intensified persecution of Revisionists across Europe, and, while praising our First Amendment, warns Americans to beware the implacable fanaticism of the Holocaust cultists. An indispensable summary of how far Revisionists have come, and what we still face.

DAVID IRVING: The brilliant controversial English historian and international bestselling author provides a sobering (but hilarious) account of his harassment and embarrassment at the behest of Jewish-Zionist groups around the world, from window-smashing campaigns in Britain to obstruction by police and immigration authorities in Germany, Austria, Italy, South Africa, Canada, and Argentina. Irving then tells the *inside* story of how his contact in Moscow discovered the missing portions of the Goebbels diaries, and how Irving himself deciphered and translated them for the (London) *Sunday Times*. Finally, Irving discusses the Eichmann "memoir," offers a controversial assessment of their value for the history of World War II German Jewish policy, and crosses swords with Robert Faurisson in a dramatic and memorable question-and-answer exchange. A superb tape!

AUDIO CASSETTES $9.95 EACH — Set of all 12 tapes in handsome cassette binder: $89
Add $1 shipping for 1st tape, 50¢ per additional tape

VHS VIDEOTAPES $29.95 EACH — (European PAL format $10 per tape additional) Enclose $1.50 shipping for 1st video, $1 per additional video.

—Available from—
INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW
Post Office Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659

The Most Ambitious Book-length Debunking to Date of the Works of Jean-Claude Pressac

AUSCHWITZ
The End of a Legend

by Carlo Mattogno

Mattogno is a learned man in the mold of his ancestors of the Renaissance. He is meticulous and prolific . . . in the first rank of Revisionists.

—Prof. Robert Faurisson

Jean-Claude Pressac's *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers* was published in 1989 to resounding worldwide media hosannas. It was followed in 1993 by his second opus, *The Crematoria of Auschwitz: The Machinery of Mass Killing*.

Pressac's principal volume, more than 500 pages with hundreds of illustrations, promised conclusive evidence of the existence and use of homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz. Headlines proclaimed that the revisionists were finally vanquished, that Pressac had proven what the immense resources of the Holocaust industry had failed to prove in more than 40 years.

But in the mad rush to herald the news, the pundits hadn't bothered to *read* the book, presuming that the French pharmacist had accomplished what his publisher–the Klarsfeld Foundation–claimed he had. He hadn't.

So Pressac's second volume was published, promising, in his own words, "*the definitive rebuttal of revisionist theories*." This dog wouldn't hunt, either.

As you read ***Auschwitz: The End of a Legend*** you'll find out why. Here, Italian documents specialist Carlo Mattogno demolishes the boldest attempt to date– Pressac's back to back volumes–to answer the revisionist critique of the Auschwitz extermination story.

Mattogno shows how Pressac misinterpreted his own data in such a way as to assist not his fellow exterminationists, but the very revisionists he had set out defeat.

Mattogno demonstrates that Pressac's confused arguments confirm his ignorance of the structure and functioning of crematory ovens and gas chambers, and of the nature and use of the disinfectant Zyklon B; that Pressac's use of available statistics was arbitrary and largely fanciful, resulting in a *down-sizing* of the number of alleged victims; and that where information did not exist, Pressac simply invented it, often with mutually contradictory arguments in different parts of his thesis.

Mattogno's relentless deconstruction of Pressac's assertions and interpretations not only reveals the Holocaust Lobby hero's incompetence, it's a case study of the pathetic sloppiness the media can be counted on to overlook in the crusade against Holocaust Revisionism.



AUSCHWITZ: The End of a Legend
Softcover • 150 pp. • index • illustrated
$12.95 + $2 postage

—Published by—
Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739 • Newport Beach, CA 92659